DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 469 808 JC 020 049

AUTHOR	Yackee, Grace Banachowski
TITLE	Perceptions of Chief Instructional Officers at Community Colleges Regarding the Employment and Utilization of Part-Time Faculty.
PUB DATE	2000-12-00
NOTE	254p.; Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation, University of Toledo. Table of contents does not correlate with pagination of document. Appendix G is not available from ERIC.
PUB TYPE	Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC11 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Accountability; *Accreditation (Institutions); Adjunct Faculty; *Administrator Attitudes; *Community Colleges; *Part Time Faculty; *Personnel Selection; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

This study examined the perceptions of chief instructional officers (CIOs) at community colleges accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) regarding: difficulty in meeting accreditation criteria for part-time faculty, challenges in implementing commonly cited practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty, and reasons for employing part-time faculty. The study found that CIOs perceived it difficult to meet 33% of accreditation criteria and implement 70% of the cited practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty. There were significant differences in these perceptions, however, based on the types of control and location of institutions. Additionally, CIOs agreed that 86% of the cited reasons for employing part-time faculty influenced the decision to employ them. There were small yet significant differences in these perceptions based on the size of their institutions. This study concluded that: (1) based on institutional type, there are significant differences in CIOs' perceptions regarding difficulty in meeting accreditation criteria; (2) practices that contribute to the effective employment and utilization of part-time faculty typically pose the greatest challenges to CIOs; and (3) regardless of institutional type, CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges agree on the reasons for employing part-time faculty. (Contains 37 tables, 165 references, and 15 appendices.) (KP)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 469 808

An Abstract of

Perceptions of Chief Instructional Officers at Community Colleges Regarding the Employment and Utilization of Part-Time Faculty

Grace Banachowski Yackee

Submitted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Doctor of Philosophy Degree in Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
G. Yackee
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

The University of Toledo
December 2000

This study identified, described, and compared the perceptions of chief instructional officers (CIOs) at community colleges accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) regarding difficulty in meeting the NCA Commission on Institutions of Higher Education's (CIHE) accreditation criteria for part-time faculty, challenges in implementing commonly cited practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty, and reasons for employing part-time faculty.

The population included CIOs from all NCA-accredited community colleges. A questionnaire developed by the researcher was mailed to 338 CIOs; 220 questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 65%. The data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The one-way ANOVA and the Scheffe post hoc test for complex comparisons were used to analyze significant differences ($p<05$) among the data.

JC 020 049

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The findings were: (a) CIOs perceived meeting 33% of accreditation criteria as difficult; (b) there were significant differences in the perceptions of difficulty in meeting certain NCA accreditation criteria among CIOs based on the type of control and location of their institutions; (c) CIOs perceived implementing 70% of the cited practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty as challenging; (d) there were significant differences in the perceptions of challenge in implementing most practices among CIOs based on the type of control and location of their institutions; (e) CIOs agreed that 86% of the cited reasons for employing part-time faculty influenced the decision to employ part-time faculty; (f) there was a small, but significant, difference in the perceptions regarding reasons for employing part-time among CIOs based on the size of their institutions.

The conclusions were: (a) there are significant differences in the perceptions regarding difficulty in meeting CIHE accreditation criteria among CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges based on institutional type; (b) the practices that contribute to the effective employment and utilization of part-time faculty are typically the same practices that pose the greatest challenge to CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges; and, (c) regardless of institutional type, CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges agree on the reasons for employing part-time faculty.

Acknowledgments

Many people have supported me through the completion of this endeavor. Their support has come in the way of positive reinforcement, motivation, patience, and unconditional friendship and love.

First, I must thank God for providing me the freedom of choice. I've been blessed with multiple open doors to opportunity and the good sense to distinguish between which ones to walk through, to ignore, and to close and move on. I have chosen quiet prayer and private praise as a means to show my appreciation for all the fortune bestowed upon me.

I would like to thank my dissertation committee, Dr. Ronald Opp, Dr. Charlotte Lee, and Dr. Paul Unger, for providing their time, expertise, critical review, and suggestions for improvement, all of which greatly enhanced the quality of this study. Special thanks goes to my doctoral advisor and dissertation chair, Dr. Stephen Katsinas, who I am proud to call my mentor, best critic, and friend. I would also like to thank Dr. Katsinas' wife, Dr. Rene' Katsinas, for unselfishly accepting the amount of time and commitment he gives to students.

Beyond my dissertation committee, there are many people who influence my life and made the completion of this endeavor possible. To my father, who, simply by example, instills in me the ability to persevere. To my mother, who may never fully understand my accomplishments, but in her own way teaches me that life is fragile and to be true to yourself despite what people think. To my siblings, who believe in my ability to achieve even during those times when I don't believe in myself. Thanks to all my dear friends for providing unconditional support and loyalty during a time when I was unable to give to them as much as they were giving to me.

My fellow students in the Higher Education Doctoral Program at the University of Toledo must be recognized for sharing an experience only we can fully comprehend. You may have finished before me, you may finish after me, but each of you know that only we really understand. Special thanks to Derrick Manns whose friendship and politically astute mind has taught me so much.

My list of thanks is far from complete without recognizing the important role played by my husband, Tim, in the completion of this project. His constant support, patience, and self-confidence encouraged me to stay focused without feeling guilty. The moment we met, a feeling of calm came over me; it has never left.

In many ways, this dissertation has become a friend. It has seen me through both challenges and life-changing events, listened when I cried and cursed, and motivated me at times when I felt that the outcome was not worth the effort. It became my distraction when the every day stresses of life brought into question my belief in meaning and purpose. It was with me, both in hand and in thought, during many sleepless nights. Most importantly, it changed the way I see myself. It is hard to let go of this friend. However, I find comfort in knowing that we will meet again.

Table of Contents

Abstract ii

Acknowledgments iv

Table of Contents vi

List of Tables xi

I. Chapter I: Introduction 1

- A. Introduction 1
- B. Statement of the Problem 4
- C. Significance of the Study 5
- D. Research Questions 12
  - 1. Primary Research Questions 12

2. Secondary Research Questions 13

E. Delimitations 14

F. Assumptions and Limitations 14

G. Definitions 16

II. Chapter II: Review of the Literature 20

A. Introduction 20

B. Issues Related to the Employment and Utilization of Part-Time Faculty at Community Colleges 22

C. Regional Higher Education Accreditation and Criteria for Part-Time Faculty 29

1. Events Leading to the Creation of the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) 35

D. The North Central Association of Colleges and Schools— Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (NCA-CIHE) 39

1. Characteristics of NCA-Accredited Postsecondary Institutions 46

2. Criteria for Accreditation 49

3. General Institutional Requirements (GIRs) 50

4. The Relationship Between Criteria for Accreditation and General Institutional Requirements (GIRs) 53

E. Diversity Among American Community Colleges 55

F. Summary 72

III. Chapter III: Methodology 75

A. Introduction 75

B. Research Questions 76

1. Primary Research Questions 76

2. Secondary Research Questions . 76

C. Research Design 78

D. Definition and Selection of Population 80

E. Instrumentation 82

1. Questionnaire Design and Description 82

2. Issues of Validity and Reliability 87

F. Data Collection Procedures 89

1. Response Rate and Response Bias/Response Selectivity 92

G. Data Analysis 94

H. Summary 98

IV: Chapter IV: Analysis of the Data 99

A. Introduction 99

B. Population, Sample, and Response Rate 100

C. Data Analysis and Findings 105

1. Quantitative Data 107

2. Qualitative Data 138

D. Summary 142

V. Chapter V: Discussion of the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations 145

A. Introduction 145

B. Discussion of the Findings 148

C. Conclusions 163

D. Recommendations for Further Research 174

E. Closing Remarks 184

VI. References 188

VII. Appendixes 209

Appendix A Excerpts of the Accrediting Standards and Policies Regarding Part-Time Faculty From the Country's Regional Accreditors 209

Appendix B The Katsinas & Lacey (1996) Community College Classification System 211

Appendix C A Chronology of Accreditation: Events Leading Up to the Establishment of the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) 212

Appendix D The North Central Association of Colleges and Schools—Commission on Institutions of Higher Education's (NCA-CIHE) Criteria for Accreditation and Related Patterns of Evidence 215

Appendix E The North Central Association of Colleges and Schools—Commission on Institutions of Higher Education's (NCA-CIHE) General Institutional Requirements (GIRs) 220

Appendix F The North Central Association of Colleges and Schools—Commission on Institutions of Higher Education's (NCA-CIHE) General Institutional

Requirements (GIRs) 9, 10, and 11 and Related Explications Regarding Faculty 222

Appendix G Meeting Regional Accreditation Criteria for Part-Time Faculty at Community Colleges: A Survey of Perceptions 225

Appendix H Cover Letter Sent to Panel of Experts 230

Appendix I Cover Letter Sent to Participants, First Mailing 232

Appendix J Reminder Postcard 233

Appendix K Cover Letter Sent to Participants, Second Mailing 234

Appendix L Means and Standard Deviations by Community College Type, Data Form Part I (Questionnaire Items 1 Through 15) 235

Appendix M Means and Standard Deviations by Community College Type, Data Form Part II (Questionnaire Items 16 Through 26) 243

Appendix N Means and Standard Deviations by Community College Type, Data Form Part III (Questionnaire Items 27 Through 32) 249

Appendix O Chief Instructional Officers' (CIOs) Suggestions and/or Comments by Data Form Parts I, II, and III 253

List of Tables

Table 1 CHEA Priorities for the 1998 Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act 8

Table 2 Commonly Cited Practices for Effectively Employing and Utilizing Part-Time Faculty 28

Table 3 States Served by U.S. Regional Higher Education Accreditor, 1998 42

Table 4 Number of Community Colleges by Regional Accreditor, State, and Type of Control, 1998 43

Table 5 Regional Higher Education Accreditor by Number of Community Colleges, Number of Accredited Community Colleges, and Community College Student Enrollment (Full-Time and Part-Time, Full Year) 45

Table 6 NCA-CIHE Criterion Two and Patterns of Evidence 51

Table 7 NCA-CIHE General Institutional Requirements (GIRs) for Faculty 53

Table 8 The Relationship Between GIRs and Criteria for Accreditation 55

Table 9 The Carnegie Classification System of Institutions of Higher Education by Major Category and Subcategory, 1973 and 1987 59

Table 10 The Carnegie Classification System of Institutions of Higher Education by Major Category and Subcategory, 1987 and 1994 61

Table 11 Number of Higher Education Institutions and Their Student Enrollment by Type and Control, 1994 62

Table 12 National Center for Education Management System's (NCEMS) Categories of Institutions of Higher Education, 1982 65

Table 13 The American Association of Community Colleges Classification System by Type of Governance 66

Table 14 Katsinas' Typology of Institutionally Distinctive Community Colleges by Geographic Location and Type, 1993 69

Table 15 The Katsinas & Lacey Community College Classification System, 1996 71

Table 16 Likert-Type Scale Response Categories and Codes by Data Form- Parts I Through III 96

Table 17 Percentage Differences Between Population and Sample by Katsinas & Lacey (1996) Community College Type Category 101

Table 18 Percentage Differences Between Population and Sample by State 103

Table 19 Percentage Differences Between 1st and 2nd Waves of Mailings 104

Table 20 Means and Standard Deviations, Data Form Part I (Questionnaire Items 1 Through 15) 108

Table 21 Means of 2.50 and Larger and Standard Deviations for Data Form Part I (Questionnaire Items I Through 15) 109

Table 22 Summary of Analysis of Variance by Type of Control (Public, Private, and Federally Chartered/Special Use): Data Form Part I (Questionnaire Items 1 Through 15) 112

Table 23 Summary of Scheffe Post Hoc Test for Complex Comparisons by Type of Control (Public, Private, and Federally Chartered/Special use): Data Form Part I (Questionnaire Items 1 through 15) 114

Table 24 Summary of Analysis of Variance by Location (Public Rural, Suburban, and Urban): Data Form Part I (Questionnaire Items 1 Through 15) 116

Table 25 Summary of Scheffe Post Hoc Test for Complex Comparisons by Location (Public Rural, Suburban, and Urban): Data Form part I (Questionnaire Items 1 Through 15) 118

Table 26 Means and Standard Deviations, Data Form Part II (Questionnaire Items 16 Through 25) 122

Table 27 Means of 2.50 and Larger and Standard Deviations for Data Form Part II (Questionnaire Items 16 Through 25) 123

Table 28 Summary of Analysis of Variance by Type of Control (Public, Private, and Federally Chartered/Special Use): Data Form Part II (Questionnaire Items 16 Through 25) 126

Table 29 Summary of Scheffe Post Hoc Test for Complex Comparisons by Type of Control (Public, Private, and Federally Chartered/Special Use): Data Form Part II (Questionnaire Items 16 Through 25) 127

Table 30 Summary of Analysis of Variance by Location (Public Rural, Suburban, and Urban): Data Form Part II (Questionnaire Items 16 Through 25) 129

Table 31 Summary of Scheffe Post Hoc Test for Complex Comparisons by Location (Public Rural, Suburban, and Urban): Data Form Part II (Questionnaire Items 16 through 25) 130

Table 32 Means and Standard Deviations, Data Form Part III (Questionnaire Items 26 Through 32) 132

Table 33 Means of 2.50 and Larger and Standard Deviations for Data Form Part III (Questionnaire Items 26 Through 32) 133

Table 34 Summary of Analysis of Variance by Size (Rural Small, Medium, and Large): Data Form Part III (Questionnaire Items 26 Through 32) 137

Table 35 Summary of Scheffe Post Hoc Test for Complex Comparisons by Size (Rural Small, Medium, and Large): Data Form Part III (Questionnaire Items 26 through 32) 138

Table 36 Proportion of Adults with a Bachelor's or Higher Degree, by State, 1990 152

Table 37 The Carnegie Classification System for Institutions of Higher Education (U.S.) by Major Category and Subcategory, and Proportion of Institutions by Carnegie Classification, 2000 170

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Introduction

The practice of employing of part-time faculty for the delivery of instruction at community colleges has been at the center of discussions in academe since the inception of the earliest two-year colleges at the turn of the 20th century. As the percentage of faculty teaching part-time significantly and steadily grew between the late 1960s and the mid-1990s, nearly doubling from 34% to 65% (American Association of Community Colleges, 1955-1988; 1997a; National Center for Education Statistics, 1998; Vaughn, 2000), concerns were raised regarding the problems associated with their use (Ashford, 1993; Astin, 1975, 1993; Clark, 1988; Fedler, 1989; Kelly, 1991; Lankard, 1993; Monroe & Denman, 1991; Pollington, 1992; Selvadurai, 1990; Spangler, 1990; Thompson, 1992; Twigg, 1989).

The concern expressed most often was that part-time faculty negatively impact the quality of students' educational experiences (Ashford, 1993; Ashworth, 1988; Astin, 1975, 1993; Clark, 1988, 1993; Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, 1988; Fedler, 1989; Friedlander, 1979;

Goldberg, 1990; Kemp, 1994; Law, 1987; Mojock, 1990; Samuel, 1989; Selvadurai, 1990; Spangler, 1990; Thompson, 1992; Williams, 1995; Wright, 1995). However, there is no empirical evidence in the higher education literature to substantiate the claim that part-time faculty undermine the educational experiences of the students they teach (Banachowski, 1996; Boggs, 1984; Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Engleberg, 1993; Franklin, 1994; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Lolly, 1980; McGuire, 1993; Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1995; Walker, 1998; Willett, 1980).

As it became increasingly apparent that the number of part-time faculty teaching at two-year institutions of higher education would not decrease in the near future, researchers interested in the topic began to focus on ways to improve practices related to employing part-time faculty rather than merely criticize their use for the delivery of instruction. Gappa & Leslie (1993) observed that arguing about the place of part-time faculty in colleges and universities is a useless exercise. Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron (1995) noted: "Positioning ourselves for or against their [part-time faculty] presence in these institutions is a futile activity. Part-time faculty are a reality in American institutions of higher education" (p. 153). Based on the findings of a nation-wide study on the utilization and integration of part-time faculty at community colleges, they concluded:

> Research data indicate that part-timers have increased steadily in number over the past twenty years, that they represent increasingly larger percentages of the total number of all college faculty, and that they will play a major role in teaching for the foreseeable future. Their numbers are swelling as increasing demands on higher education and

> declining funding combine with impending waves of faculty retirement and the resulting faculty shortages. Colleges must change the way they think about providing educational services in the future (p. 153).

Because quality education is directly linked to quality instruction, higher education accreditors include measures of quality faculty and effective teaching in their overall evaluations of colleges and universities. By 1990, regional accreditors developed assessment or institutional effectiveness policies with similar basic features, including criteria against which faculty are judged as part of the accreditation process (Ewell, 1994). Today, all six regional accreditors—including the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges—have published statements on institutional standards and policies regarding faculty, both full- and part-time. For example, the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) states:

> Faculty responsibilities at an institution are best fulfilled when a core of full-time teaching faculty has as its primary commitment the education programs provided by the institution. This means full-time rather than part-time employment at the institution. There is no precise mathematical formula to determine the appropriate number of full-time faculty each institution should have. However, it is reasonable to expect that an institution would seldom have fewer than one full-time faculty member for each major that it offers ("Accrediting standards regarding part-time instructors...," 1997, p.13).

(See Appendix A for complete statements on part-time faculty from all six regional accreditors.)

The North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) is the regional accreditor that was the focus of this investigation. The Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) conducts the NCA postsecondary accreditation process. The Commission established Criteria for Accreditation in 1981 and General Institutional Requirements (GIRs) in 1987 to define the essential characteristics expected of all NCA-affiliated institutions. The Criteria for Accreditation and GIRs, including those related to part-time faculty, were revised in 1992 and currently serve as the basis for the NCA higher education accreditation process. The Commission applies the same criteria regarding faculty to both full-time and part-time faculty.

The North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) was chosen as the focus of this investigation because it is the largest of the six regional accrediting bodies in the United States. It accredits educational institutions in 19 U.S. states, while the next largest regional accreditor, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, accredits educational institutions in 11 U.S. states. In the fall of 1997, 968 colleges and universities were accredited by the NCA. An additional 18 institutions of higher education held NCA candidacy status (NCA-CIHE, 1997e). The vastness of the North Central Association in comparison to the other five regional accreditors in terms of the number of states, two-year institutions, and students served is discussed in greater detail in Chapter II.

Statement of the Problem

The primary purpose of this study was to identify and describe the perceptions of chief instructional officers (CIOs) at community colleges accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) regarding the amount of difficulty experienced in meeting the NCA-Commission on Institutions of Higher Education's (CIHE) Criteria for Accreditation and General Institutional Requirements (GIRs) for part-time faculty.

There were three secondary purposes of this study, including the following:

1. To identify and describe the perceptions of CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges regarding the amount of challenge experienced in implementing commonly cited practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty.
2. To identify and describe the perceptions of CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges regarding the amount of influence commonly cited reasons for employing part-time faculty have on the decision to employ part-time faculty.
3. To compare differences in the data by community college type based on type of control (public, private, federally chartered/special use), location (public rural, suburban, urban), and size (rural small, medium, and large).

Significance of the Study

The Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) was established in 1996 and serves as the national advocate for voluntary self-regulation of higher education through accreditation. It coordinates all six regional higher education accrediting bodies in the United States. In a June 1997 Report, CHEA announced its higher education accreditation priorities, which included enhancing the usefulness of accreditation and improving the accreditation process. One of the goals identified in the Report directly relates to the scope of the investigation at hand: "To design a strategy for both the chief academic officers and the team visit members to comment on the accreditation process" (CHEA, 1997a, p. 3). Specifically, this study provided an opportunity for CIOs at community colleges accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) to comment on the Association's higher education accreditation process, particularly as it relates to the use of part-time faculty.

The Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) was established, in part, to develop a new national accrediting group "strong enough to deter governmental intrusion and to contain the activities of the specialized accrediting associations" (CHEA, 1996b, p. 36). Soon after it was established, CHEA responded to the concern that there were signs of increasing intervention in academic matters by state and federal governments that threatened the very future of accreditation in the United States. In collaboration with other Washington-based national higher education associations, the Council announced its priorities for the 1998 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act: Its first priority was to "clarify the limitations of the federal government's regulatory authority over academic matters and reaffirm the role of accreditation in quality assurance for higher education" (CHEA, 1997b, p. 2). All CHEA priorities are presented in Table 1.

Given their concerns regarding past, present, and future intervention in academe on behalf of the federal and state governments, it is likely that regional accreditors will continue to play the central role in voluntary self-regulation of academic matters. This certainly includes the use of part-time faculty. It is hoped that the data from this study can be used to improve the regional accreditation process, and, subsequently, foster institutional improvement.

The significance of this investigation lies in part in the observation that the higher education literature lacks a basic examination of the use of part-time community college faculty as it relates to regional accreditation in general, and the accreditation process conducted by the nation's largest regional higher education accreditor, specifically. To date, no empirically based multi-institutional study has been conducted on the issues related to the employment and utilization of part-time faculty at NCA-accredited two-year colleges. This is an important point considering institutions must meet all criteria, including those for faculty, in order to achieve accreditation status.

In 1992, the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) revised its Criteria for Accreditation and General Institutional Requirements (GIRs), including those related to part-time faculty (NCA-CIHE, 1997f). Although

Table 1

CHEA Priorities for the 1998 Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act

---

1. Clarify the limitations of the federal government's regulatory authority over academic matters and reaffirm the role of accreditation in quality assurance for higher education.

2. Eliminate State Postsecondary Review Entity program (SPRE) language.

3. Distinguish and reaffirm the respective roles of the federal government (fiscal oversight), accreditation (quality assurance and improvement), and states (consumer protection) in ensuring educational, financial and administrative integrity in student aid programs.

Additional language change to:

4. Eliminate duplicate reporting between the higher education community and the federal government for Title IV.

5. Clarify that new instructional sites of existing programs are not "branch campuses".

6. Eliminate mandatory site visit requirements for accreditors for program changes (visits within six months) and vocational programs (unannounced visits).

7. Affirm that public and private college trustees may participate as representatives of the public in accrediting associations.

8. Change the language of the USDE [U.S. Department of Education] regulatory authority to "recognize" rather than "approve" the content of accreditation standards.

Source: Council for Higher Education Accreditation. (1997, November). Higher education reauthorization. The CHEA Chronicle (7), 1-3. [On-Line]. Available: http://www.chea.org/ Perspective/Chronicle/Vol1/no7/HEA.html, September 9, 1998.

member institutions participated in the revision process, there have been no attempts to examine the implementation of these standards from the eyes of administrators at NCA-accredited community colleges. Specifically, there are no data currently available to either verify or negate the amount of difficulty experienced by administrators at NCA-accredited community colleges in meeting accreditation criteria regarding part-time faculty. This study provided an opportunity for chief instructional officers (CIOs) at two-year colleges accredited by the NCA to comment on the Commission's Criteria for Accreditation and GIRs regarding practices related to the employment and utilization of part-time faculty.

Despite the fact that NCA accreditation is based, in part, on compliance with guidelines for employing part-time faculty, there is a very limited amount of information and research on the topic of meeting accreditation criteria for part-time faculty. Between 1995 and 1997, the NCA Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) did form a committee to conduct an investigation into the effectiveness of the accreditation process (NCA-CIHE, 1998). The committee, named the Committee on Organizational Effectiveness and Future Directions (COEFD), was given the following charge:

1. To examine the Commission's mission and purposes and its resources for accomplishing its purposes.
2. To document its current effectiveness and identify areas for improvement.
3. To propose directions for the Commission's future (p. 3).

The COEFD's did not, however, address the Commission's criteria regarding part-time faculty. This is an important point to consider in that regional accreditors have recently come under attack for failing to uphold their own standards for part-time faculty, particularly part-time faculty at community colleges (Ewell, 1994; Leatherman, 1997; Report of the National Policy Board on Higher Education Institutional Accreditation, 1994; Palinchak, 1993).

Further, this study is significant because the data were organized and analyzed by institutional type. Researchers and practitioners have long documented significant differences in the issues and challenges faced by community colleges based on type of control, geographic location, and size (American Association of Community Colleges, 1998a, 1998b; Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Eaton, 1994; Jackson, 1988; Katsinas & Lacey, 1996; Katsinas, 1993, 1996; Kienzl & Li, 1997; Killacky & Valadez, 1995; Lee, 1997; Milam, 1995; Murphy, 1980; Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron 1995, 1996a; 1996b; Scheibmeir 1980; Zwerling, 1976). These findings, to which this study is related, are discussed in greater detail in Chapter II.

Community colleges accredited by the NCA can directly benefit from the results of this study, particularly from the findings related to differences in the perceptions of chief instructional officers based on community college type. At the March 10, 2000 Ohio Community College Assessment Forum held in Columbus, Ohio, Dr. Stephen Spangehl, staff liaison from the NCA Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE), acknowledged that like institutions experience similar accreditation issues and problems. Drawing on years of professional experience from working with over 200 NCA-accredited colleges and universities, he contended that NCA-accredited colleges and universities benefit from interacting with institutions "like themselves" and from discussing common challenges and solutions to problems (cited from Dr. Stephen Spangehl's opening remarks at the 2000 Ohio Assessment Forum).

Dr. Spangehl's comments suggest that institutional practices differ by community college type and support usage of the Katsinas & Lacey (1996) Community College Classification System. Katsinas & Lacey use the system to categorize two-year colleges based on three factors: type of control (public, private, and federally chartered/special use), location (public rural, urban, and suburban), and size (rural small, medium and large). The comprehensive classification scheme is built on 11 exclusive institutional categories, and provides two-year colleges a readily available resource for classifying themselves and identifying institutions "like themselves". The Community College Classification System developed by Katsinas & Lacey is further discussed in Chapter II.

Ultimately, the study's findings shed light on the employment of part-time faculty at NCA-accredited community colleges, differentiated by institutional type. NCA-accredited two-year colleges and their constituents, including governing and coordinating boards, community colleges affiliated with other accrediting bodies, policy-makers, administrators, and faculty can benefit from this study. They can use the findings to gain a better understanding of the great diversity that exists among the country's two-year institutions and, subsequently, use this information to develop comprehensive plans and effective policies for improving the practices related to the employment of part-time faculty.

Research Questions

Given the exploratory and descriptive nature of this investigation, coupled with the limited amount information on the topic, the study posed research questions rather than hypotheses to guide the collection and analysis of the data.

Primary Research Questions

1. Do CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges perceive meeting CIHE accreditation criteria for part-time faculty as difficult?
    a. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of difficulty in meeting CIHE accreditation criteria for part-time faculty among CIOs at public, private, and federally chartered/special use NCA-accredited community colleges?
    b. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of difficulty in meeting CIHE accreditation criteria for part-time faculty among CIOs at rural, suburban, and urban public NCA-accredited community colleges?
    c. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of difficulty in meeting CIHE accreditation criteria for part-time faculty among CIOs

at small, medium, and large rural NCA-accredited community colleges?

Secondary Research Questions

2. Do CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges perceive implementing commonly cited practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty as challenging?
    a. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of challenge in implementing commonly cited practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty among CIOs at public, private, and federally chartered/special use NCA-accredited community colleges?
    b. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of challenge in implementing commonly cited practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty among CIOs at rural, suburban, and urban public NCA-accredited community colleges?
    c. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of challenge in implementing commonly cited practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty among CIOs at small, medium, and large rural NCA-accredited community colleges?
2. Do CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges perceive commonly cited reasons for employing part-time faculty as influential on the decision to employ part-time faculty?
    a. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of influential reasons for employing part-time faculty among CIOs at public, private,

and federally chartered/special use NCA-accredited community colleges?

a. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of influential reasons for employing part-time faculty among CIOs at rural, suburban, and urban public NCA-accredited community colleges?

b. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of influential reasons for employing part-time faculty among CIOs at small, medium, and large rural NCA-accredited community colleges?

Delimitations

The following delimitations apply to this study:

1. The scope of this study was limited to chief instructional officers at NCA-accredited community colleges. There were 340 NCA-accredited community colleges as of November 14, 1997 (NCA-CIHE, 1997e).
2. This investigation was limited to regional/institutional accreditation and did not include specialized/ program/professional accreditation (see definitions below).
3. The generalizability of the study's findings was limited to the population under investigation.

Assumptions and Limitations

The following limitations and assumptions applied to this study:

1. It was assumed two-year colleges that achieved member status of accredited met the minimum criteria for employing part-time faculty as defined by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) of

the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA). All institutions in the survey population held NCA accreditation status as of November 14, 1997 (NCA-CIHE, 1997e).

2. It was assumed that the survey used, which was reviewed by a panel of experts for face and content validity, accurately measured perceptions of the study population.
3. It was assumed that the individuals chosen by the researcher (based on their experience in the areas of part-time faculty, community colleges, national and regional accreditation processes, and survey design) to review the survey instrument were qualified and competent, as a group, to assess the validity and reliability of the survey instrument.
4. It was assumed that survey respondents answered survey items honestly and comprehensively.
5. It was assumed that the Katsinas & Lacey (1996) Community College Classification System was an appropriate tool for organizing the data by community college type.
6. The findings of this study were limited by the researcher's interchangeable use of the words community college, technical college, and two-year college. In an effort to maintain consistency among the referenced literature and research, the Katsinas & Lacey (1996) Community College Classification System, and the data analysis and findings in this study, the researcher assumed that the interchangeable use of these three words was appropriate.

Definitions

The following terms appeared in this study. To assure common understanding, definitions of these terms (organized by topic) follow.

Part-Time Faculty

Individuals an employing institution recognizes, legally and contractually, as less than full-time employees. This definition is consistent with that used by the U.S. Department of Education (National Center for Education Statistics, 1998).

Higher Education Accreditation

National Accreditor: An accrediting organization created at the national level to enhance coordination of higher education accrediting activities and to recognize regional accreditation agencies.

Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA): The non-profit organization of colleges and universities that recognizes higher education regional accrediting bodies, and serves as the national advocate for voluntary self-regulation through accreditation for higher education. CHEA coordinates the country's six regional accrediting bodies.

Regional/Institutional Accreditor: An accrediting body that evaluates "the overall quality of institutions without making judgments about specific programs. Institutional accreditation is accreditation of the whole institution, including all programs and sites" (NCA, 1998, p. 3). Six regional accrediting bodies (and nine commissions internal to them) make-up the regional system of higher education accreditation in the United States. Institutional accreditation is separate from the accreditation given or withheld by specialized/professional associations (NCA-CIHE, 1997f).

Specialized/Professional/Program Accreditor: An accrediting body that evaluates particular units, schools, or individual programs, such as those preparing students to practice a profession. They "apply specific standards for curriculum and course content" and are often associated with national professional associations (NCA-CIHE, 1997a, p. 3).

North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA): The regional accrediting body for all levels of education (elementary, secondary, and postsecondary) in the north central region, including those institutions in the states of Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

North Central Association of Colleges and Schools-Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (NCA-CIHE): The regional accrediting commission for all higher education institutions in the NCA region. CIHE conducts the NCA postsecondary accreditation process.

Affiliate Institutions: Colleges and universities holding either NCA candidate or accreditation status.

Candidate Status: "Candidacy is a preaccreditation status, and, unlike accreditation, does not carry with it membership in the NCA. Candidacy indicates that an institution fulfills the expectations of the CIHE Candidacy Program, which include meeting the General Institutional Requirements

(GIRs)" (NCA-CIHE, 1997f, p. 9). It is the first step in making progress toward accreditation.

Accreditation Status: "Accreditation of an institution establishes that institution's membership in the North Central Association. Accreditation indicates both to other institutions and to the public that an institution meets CIHE's Criteria for Accreditation and General Institutional Requirements (GIRs). It also indicates the institution's commitment to the purposes and goals of the Association. An institution becomes accredited through the [NCA] evaluation process" (NCA, 1997f, p. 9). Accredited institutions are frequently referred to as "affiliate" or "member" institutions.

Population

Community College: An institution of higher education whose highest degree awarded is the associate degree, which includes one or more of the following degrees: the associate of arts, the associate of science, and/or the associate of applied science. The terms "two-year college" and "community college" are used interchangeably within this study.

NCA-Accredited Community College: A public, private, federally chartered or special use community college in the NCA region holding NCA-accreditation status as a result of NCA-CIHE actions through November 14, 1997 (as listed in the NCA-CIHE Directory of CIHE Affiliated Institutions, 1997e).

Chief Instructional Officer: The person holding the highest position in a community college's office or department of academic affairs who is directly responsible for all aspects of academic affairs at the institution. This person may hold the title of provost, vice chancellor for academic affairs, vice chancellor of instruction, vice president for academic affairs, dean of academic affairs, vice president of instruction, or dean of instruction.

The Katsinas & Lacey Community College Classification System: The system for classifying American two-year colleges developed by Stephen G. Katsinas and Vincent A. Lacey (1996). Using this system, Katsinas & Lacey organized community colleges into 11 institutionally distinct categories based on three factors: type of control (public, private, federally chartered/special use), location (public rural, urban, suburban), and size (rural small, medium and large) (see Appendix B). The system was used to organize the data in this study.

CHAPTER II

Review of the Literature

Introduction

The practice of employing part-time faculty for the delivery of instruction at two-year colleges has been at the center of discussions in academe for over 100 years. Until the late 1980s and early 1990s, the discussions typically focused on the perceived problems associated with their use. The concern expressed most often was part-time faculty negatively impact the quality of students' educational experiences. Institutional higher education accrediting bodies responded to this concern by incorporating guidelines for employing faculty and measures of quality faculty and effective teaching in their overall evaluations of colleges and universities.

Today, the six U.S. regional accrediting bodies have published statements on the use of part-time faculty for the delivery of instruction at colleges and universities. Although all six require affiliate institutions to meet specific criteria related to the employment of part-time faculty, none prescribe a definitive part-time to full-time faculty ratio. Instead, all require affiliate institutions to insure that faculty, regardless of teaching status, are qualified to deliver instruction. As measured by accreditors, the quality of an institution's faculty is determined by the degree to which that institution meets accreditation criteria for faculty.

The North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) is the largest of the six regional accrediting bodies, and thus the focus of this investigation. The Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) conducts the NCA higher education accreditation process. In 1992, CIHE initiated a significant reexamination of its policies, procedures, requirements, criteria, and mission. In 1993, CIHE published the revised criteria for accreditation, including the criteria related to faculty, both full- and part-time. However, despite the well-publicized issues surrounding the growth of part-time faculty at community colleges, both in number and percentage, nothing in the way of empirically based research on the implementation of CIHE's accreditation criteria for part-time faculty has been conducted to date.

The purpose of this study was to identify and describe the perceptions of chief instructional officers (CIOs) regarding issues related to the employment and utilization of part-time faculty at NCA-accredited community colleges. The data were analyzed by community college type. In support of the purpose of the study, this chapter provides a thorough review of the higher education literature on the topics of part-time faculty at two-year colleges and regional accreditation criteria for part-time faculty. Specifically, the topics discussed in this chapter include: (a) issues related to the employment and utilization of part-time faculty at community colleges; (b) regional higher education accreditation criteria and part-time faculty; (c) the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools—Commission on Institutions of Higher Education's (NCA-CIHE), including Criteria for Accreditation and General Institutional Requirements (GIRs) for part-time faculty; and (d) diversity among American two-year colleges. The chapter ends with a summary of the topics covered in previous text.

Issues Related to the Employment and Utilization of Part-Time Faculty at Community Colleges

Two-year colleges have a long history of relying on part-time faculty for the delivery of instruction (Eells, 1931; Ratcliff, 1987). In the early years, sizable numbers of instructors, frequently from local high schools, taught on a part-time basis (Cohen & Brawer 1996; Eells, 1931). The percentage of part-time faculty steadily grew until 1995. In 1968, 34% of community college faculty taught part-time, 55% in 1978, 60% in 1986, and 65% in 1995 (American Association of Community Colleges, 1955-1988; National Center for Education Statistics, 1998). Since 1995, the percentage of part-time faculty teaching at community colleges has remained stable (American Association of Community Colleges, 1997a; National Center for Education Statistics, 1998; Phillippe, 1998; Schneider, 1998; Vaughn, 2000).

As the number and percentage of part-time faculty employed by two-year colleges has increased over the past decade, the practice has been at the center of discussions in academe. Proponents of employing part-time faculty contend that their use poses economic, practical and pedagogical benefits. These benefits include, but are not limited to, the following: (a) helping institutions meet their historical role of increasing access to higher education (Miller, 1992; Milliron, 1995; Osborn, 1990; Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1996a); (b) saving an institution money, in both salaries and benefits (Avakian, 1995; Mangan, 1991; McGuire, 1993; Osborn, 1990; Walker, 1998); (c) allowing institutions to be flexible in matching staffing to fluctuating enrollments (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Lankard, 1993; Osborn, 1990); (d) bringing "real life vocational experience" into the classroom (Cline, 1993, p. 26; Cohen, 1992; Kelly, 1991; Littrell, 1990; McGuire, 1993); and, (e) providing people who enjoy teaching an opportunity to teach (Cohen, 1992; Wilson, 1998).

Despite the benefits of employing part-time faculty, critics of the practice consistently contend that the costs of employing part-time faculty are numerous. For example, some assert that part-time faculty take-away full-time teaching positions (American Association of University Professors, 1998; American Federation of Teachers, 1998a; Clark, 1988, 1993; Twigg, 1989). Others argue that part-timers themselves suffer as a result of an inferior status and exploitation (Kelly, 1991; Lankard, 1993; Lee, 1997; Pollington, 1992; Twigg, 1989), role ambiguity (Fabisinski, 1994; Monroe & Denman, 1991; Schaffer, 1995), and lack of integration into institutional cultures (Burnstad & Wheeler, 1994; Gordon, 1990; Milliron, 1995; Roueche, Roueche & Milliron, 1995, 1996a, 1996b).

The most commonly cited concern regarding the employment of part-time faculty for the delivery of instruction at community colleges is that the practice undermines the quality of students' educational experiences (Ashford, 1993; Ashworth, 1988; Astin, 1993; Clark, 1988, 1993; Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, 1988; Conference on College Composition and Communication, 1989; Fedler, 1989; Franklin, 1994; Friedlander, 1979; Goldberg, 1990; Kemp, 1994; Law, 1987; Mojock, 1990; Samuel, 1989; Selvadurai, 1990; Spangler, 1990; Thompson, 1992; Williams, 1995; Wright, 1995). Still, there is no empirical evidence to substantiate the perception that part-time faculty undermine the educational experiences of the students they teach (Banachowski, 1996; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Lolly, 1980; Rifkin, 1997; Weintraub, 1975 cited in Lombardi, 1992; Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1995; Washington State Board of Community and Technical Colleges, 1998; Willett, 1980). Specifically, empirical studies and literature reviews to date have found no significant differences in student ratings, class retention, or student achievement in subsequent classes between students taught by part-time faculty and those taught by full-time faculty (Banachowski, 1996; Boggs, 1984; Bolge 1995; California Community Colleges, 1988; Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Franklin, 1994; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Iadevaia, 1991; Lolly, 1980; McGuire, 1993).

Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron (1995) concluded what, in their opinion, is the practical insignificance of the often heated debate over instructional quality and part-time faculty. "More than twenty years of research points to little or no difference in the instructional ability of part-time faculty" (p. 44). Citing the findings of Gappa & Leslies' (1993) national study on part-time faculty, they noted:

> There is little evidence that in any way implicates part-time teaching as the culprit in any instructional quality 'crime'. In fact, much of it points to the notion that 'in a sense'...part-timers may be held to a higher standard of teaching performance on the average than full-timers (p. 125).

Although the practice of employing part-time faculty continues to be a subject of debate, community colleges will proceed to utilize them in significant numbers for the delivery of instruction (Engleberg, 1993; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kelly, 1991; Mangan, 1991; Walker,1998). They have long been part of the faculty. A 1920s study by Eells (1931) revealed that 50 to 90 percent of the faculty at two-year colleges were part-time employees. Additionally, they have played an important role in the growth and stability of community colleges since the 1970s. As argued by Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron (1996b), "Without part-time faculty, community colleges would have been hard pressed to serve the expanding cohort of part-time students in the 1970s and 1980s and to survive the recession of the late 1980s and early 1990s" (p. 106).

More recently, part-time faculty have been integral to the community college's ability to fulfill the access function. In the last ten years, the practice of employing part-time faculty has enhanced the community college's ability to meet a rapidly increasing demand for services. Research shows that employing part-time faculty saves institutions money which enhances their ability to keep tuition low and, as a consequence, provide access to education to a larger number of people (Avakian, 1995; Freeland, 1998; Leslie, 1998; Miller, 1992; Osborn, 1990; Walker, 1998).

Regardless of whether the costs of employing part-timers outweigh the benefits, or vice versa, the fact remains that they are clearly an integral part of the faculty at community colleges in this country. In the absence of empirical evidence persuasively showing that part-time faculty teach less effectively than full-time faculty, it is unlikely that their use will decrease or even subside within an environment characterized by shrinking federal and state support for higher education, and the societal pressure to increase access through affordable tuition. Instead, it is likely that community colleges will continue employing a significant number of part-time faculty to maintain existing college services and expand college program offerings for many years to come (Engleberg, 1993; Walker, 1998).

In the absence of empirical evidence to substantiate the claim that employing part-time faculty for the delivery of instruction at community colleges poses more harm than good, coupled with the likelihood that large numbers of part-time faculty will continue to be employed by community colleges, focus on the topic has shifted from debating advantages and disadvantages to identifying and implementing practices for effectively employing part-time faculty.

In their book, Strangers in Their Own Land: Part-Time Faculty in American Community Colleges, Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron (1995) documented trends in the employment and utilization of part-time faculty in community colleges. Based on a thorough review of the literature and the findings of their research on the topic, they identified a number of practices that administrators at community colleges consider to be important for effectively employing and utilizing part-time faculty, but challenging to implement, including: (a) recruiting part-time faculty; (b) selecting/hiring part-time faculty; (c) orienting part-time faculty; (d) involving part-time faculty in college life; (e) providing staff development for part-time faculty; (f) evaluating part-time faculty; and, (g) retaining part-time faculty.

Burnstad & Wheeler (1996) echoed Roueche, Roueche, and Millirons' (1995) findings. They identified several aspects of an integrated system for effectively employing and utilizing part-time faculty, including orientation, professional development, communication, and institutional policy and practices. Citing Biles & Tuckman (1986) and Gappa & Leslie (1993), they noted that recruitment, selection, and evaluation are also important processes in an integrated system (p. 23). Allysen (1996) found that implementing standards for recruiting, hiring, and evaluating part-time faculty and providing part-time faculty with opportunities for professional development contributed to the integration of part-time faculty into institutional environments. Digranes & Digranes (1995) concluded that effective part-time faculty development programs include training in the use of instructional technology. (See Table 2 for a list of the commonly cited practices for effectively employing and utilizing part-time faculty at two-year colleges identified in the literature and research on the topic.)

Table 2

Commonly Cited Practices for Effectively Employing and Utilizing Part-Time Faculty at Two-Year Colleges

---

Recruiting Part-Time Faculty

Selecting/Hiring Part-Time Faculty

Orienting Part-Time Faculty to Institutional Culture

Involving Part-Time Faculty in College Life

Providing Professional Development for Part-Time Faculty

Monitoring the Extent to Which Part-Time Faculty Maintain Current in Their Discipline

Supervising Part-Time Faculty

Evaluating Part-Time Faculty

Retaining Part-Time Faculty

Source: Literature and research on the topic discussed above

The items on the study questionnaire designed to measure the perceptions of chief instructional officers (CIOs) toward the amount of challenge experienced in implementing commonly cited practices for effectively employing and utilizing part-time faculty were developed with reference to the aforementioned literature and research.

Just as the higher education community turned its focus away from criticizing the use of part-time faculty for the delivery of instruction to improving the practice of employing and utilizing part-time faculty, higher education regional accrediting bodies responsible for monitoring the quality of instruction at affiliate institutions developed guidelines for employing faculty. These guidelines, applied to both full- and part-time faculty, provide a standard against which consultant evaluators judge whether or not an institution meets accreditation criteria regarding quality instruction. Accredited colleges and universities are expected to meet all standards.

In assessing initiatives for effectively employing and utilizing part-time faculty, Parsons (1998) found that two-year colleges frequently look to standards established by their regional accrediting agency. Attention is now turned to a discussion of higher education regional accrediting bodies and the role they play in monitoring the employment and utilization of part-time faculty at community colleges.

Regional Higher Education Accreditation and Criteria For Part-Time Faculty

Associations responsible for accrediting academic programs that are administratively located in both degree and non-degree granting institutions are called specialized or professional accrediting associations. Professional accreditors focus on the quality of professional preparation of students at member institutions. Private non-governmental organizations responsible for accrediting entire institutions are called regional or institutional accrediting associations. Regional accreditors focus on financial status, governance, student services, faculty and staff relations, and student learning and achievement, and assess the quality of curriculum, faculty, and student services.

Institutional accreditation is a uniquely American phenomenon. In most other countries, governmental regulations mandate the accreditation process, and assessments of institutional quality are directly conducted by governmental entities. Voluntary institutional accreditation emerged in this country as a vehicle to provide public assurance that minimum quality standards are met, and to guard against unacceptable practices in higher education. "The accreditation process reflects American higher education's core values of autonomy, self-governance, and the assurance of quality through peer review" (CHEA, 1998a, p. 2). On-going initiatives to improve educational quality and institutional effectiveness are ultimately expressions of accreditors' commitment to continual self-improvement.

Accrediting associations function as voluntary "gatekeepers" responsible for enforcing federal regulations and providing institutions access to federal dollars. Historically, the federal government has relied on accrediting agencies to make the judgments about the quality of education offered by institutions that participate, or seek to participate, in federal student aid programs. The Veterans' Readjustment Act of 1944 and subsequent amendments to that Act required that institutions be accredited by nationally recognized accrediting agencies and associations which were "determined [by the U.S. Secretary of Education] to be a reliable authority as to the quality of training offered by an educational institution" (Public Law 550, Chapter 875, HR 7656, July 16, 1952, p. 675). This language, or language similar to it, has since been incorporated into nearly every piece of federal legislation related to higher education.

During the early stages of reauthorization in 1992, voluntary accreditation as carried out by regional higher education accrediting bodies was written out of the Higher Education Act. In a major break with past tradition, Congress threatened to federalize accreditation by replacing institutional accrediting associations with state education agencies, called State Postsecondary Review Entities (SPREs). The provision that SPREs replace regional accrediting bodies as the primary reviewers of colleges seeking to participate in federal student-aid programs came in reaction to the findings of the well-publicized congressional hearings on the status of higher education, conducted in the early 1990s and chaired by Sam Nunn, former democratic senator from Georgia. During these hearings, Congress unmasked incidences of flagrant fraud and abuse in higher education student aid programs, and listened to college and university students testify to benign cases of student aid fraud and abuse. Students frequently claimed that financial aid dollars were being used to pay for poor quality instruction delivered by unqualified faculty. As a result, according to Longanecker (1994),

> Some members of congress believed that Peer review systems could not function with the rigor required to restore credibility to student aid programs. Some also felt the public purpose of insuring integrity in the

> institutions that participated in federal student aid programs could not be entrusted to essentially private entities and looked to states to play greatly expanded roles in gatekeeping for federal funds (p. 14).

Despite the inclusion of SPREs in the language of the 1992 amendments, college presidents and educational organizations successfully lobbied to keep gatekeeping responsibilities in the hands of accrediting associations (Jaschik, 1992). The Higher Education Act of 1992 did, however, include measures by which the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education could judge the accreditors by deciding which ones to recognize. It also required accreditors to establish standards for assessing the quality of curriculum, faculty, and student support services, and to insure institutional financial viability and truthfulness in advertising. The Secretary of Education would recognize only those accreditors with standards and guarantees in place.

Institutional accreditation continues to be the principal requirement for institutional eligibility to disperse federal student aid funds, which totaled nearly $46 billion in academic year 1998-1999 (The College Board, cited in the "2000-2001 Almanac Issue," 2000, p. 2). The 1998 amendments to the 1992 Higher Education Act reaffirmed the federal government's requirement that accrediting associations assess the quality of curriculum, faculty, and student services. However, several changes signifying a reduced role of the federal government in voluntary regulation took place between the reauthorizations of the Act in 1992 and 1998. The terminology describing the role of the Secretary of Education in monitoring regional accreditors changed from "approving" to "recognizing" accreditation "criteria" (previously called "standards") (Public Law 105-244, Part H, Section 492, U.S.C., 1099b, October 7, 1998). Additionally, the refusal of the six regional higher education accrediting organizations to support state oversight by the State Postsecondary Review Entities (SPREs) led to their demise in 1995 (Newman, 1996). As a result, the SPREs program was repealed and formally eliminated from the language of the Higher Education Act (Public Law 105-244, Part H, Section 496, U.S.C., 1099b, October 7, 1998.)

Today, the U.S. Department of Education continues to maintain a list of accrediting bodies determined by the Secretary of Education to be "reliable authorities as to the quality of training offered by educational institutions and programs" (NCA-CIHE, 1997a, p. 3). Each year this list is published by the Secretary in the Federal Register, publicly announcing "certified" institutions (i.e., institutions certified as eligible to participate in federal student aid programs). Students can obtain federal grants and loans only if they attend colleges and universities accredited by a regional accrediting association certified by the Department of Education.

While the federal government ultimately determines which institutions are certified to participate in federal student aid programs, the role of accrediting higher education institutions is predominantly in the hands of regional accreditors. Thus, in an era when colleges and universities face increasing accountability from multiple sources, regional accreditors are responsible for making judgments about the quality of education at member institutions. They are expected to monitor institutional policies and practices and establish guidelines for judging institutional quality and effectiveness. Additionally, the federal government mandates that regional accreditors do more than simply establish a set of criteria for judging institutional effectiveness and quality. According to Ernst Benjamin (1994),

> Accrediting bodies are not only expected to assess institutional documentation of student achievement, ensure that these measures are used to improve achievement, and see to it that institutional performance is consistent with institutional goals. Accrediting bodies also must guarantee that their "criteria and standards are valid and reliable indicators of the quality of the education or training provided." Further, they must "demonstrate" that each standard is a "valid" and "consistent" measure (p. 35).

Because quality education is directly linked to quality instruction, higher education accreditors include measures of quality faculty and effective teaching in their overall evaluations of colleges and universities. The Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), which coordinates higher education accrediting activities at the national level, and the country's six regional accreditors (and the nine commissions and councils internal to them) have developed general standards regarding the use of part-time faculty at member institutions. Recognizing that rigid quantitative measures are questionable indices of effective teaching and learning, accreditors have shied away from definitive prescriptions for the appropriate part-time to full-time faculty ratio. Neither CHEA nor any of the six regional accrediting bodies have identified a precise formula for determining the balance between full- and part-time faculty. Instead, they have established standards and criteria that reflect their basic expectations of all affiliated institutions, simultaneously observing the variety and uniqueness of institutions that depict the American system of higher education.

A review of the accreditors' published statements regarding part-time faculty reveals that regional accreditors are not concerned about total numbers of part-time faculty or, for that matter, full-to part-time faculty ratios. Although none of the six regional accreditors give a precise formula for determining the balance between full-and part-time faculty, each states that institutions must insure that faculty, regardless of teaching status, are qualified to deliver instruction. For example, the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools—Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (NCA-CIHE) states:

> Faculty responsibilities at an institution are best fulfilled when a core of full-time teaching faculty has as its primary commitment the education programs provided by the institution. This means full-time rather than part-time employment at the institution. There is no precise mathematical formula to determine the appropriate number of full-time faculty each institution should have. However, it is reasonable to expect that an institution would seldom have fewer than one full-time faculty member for each major that it offers ("Accrediting standards regarding part-time instructors…," 1997, p.13).

(See Appendix A to review the complete statements on part-time faculty from all six regional accreditors.)

Events Leading to the Creation of the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA)

In 1996, the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) was established in part to develop a new national accrediting group "strong enough to deter further governmental intrusion [into higher education] and to contain the activities of the specialized accrediting associations" (CHEA, 1996a, p. 36). CHEA succeeded a number of predecessors, including the temporarily named National Policy Board on Higher Education Institutional Accreditation (NPB), the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) which dissolved in December 1993, as well as COPA's predecessor, the Commission on Recognition of Postsecondary Accreditation (CORPA). (See Appendix C for a detailed list and description of events leading up to the establishment of CHEA.)

In June 1993, representatives from the six regional accrediting bodies and the heads of the seven largest national higher education associations met to discuss major issues facing accreditation and how to address them. This group was eventually named the National Policy Board on Higher Education Institutional Accreditation (NPB). It established the Higher Education Institutional Accreditation Board (HEAB) to consider accreditation alternatives for the future. The NPB concluded that the most pressing problem facing the country's system of voluntary self-regulation was an increasing trend toward intrusion into academic matters by the federal government (Report of the National Policy Board on Higher Education Institutional Accreditation, 1994). By this time, the federal government was playing an increasing role in the funding of higher education and, subsequently, expected institutions receiving federal dollars to certify institutional quality and effectiveness. According to Benjamin (1994), federally directed higher education regulatory activities were already in place, including "the development of government-directed examination of graduates, federal regulation of institutional accreditation, direct federal-state regulation of institutions themselves, and transformation of accreditation from voluntary self-assessment to external monitoring of institutional performance" (p. 34).

When COPA disbanded in December of 1993, the National Policy Board on Higher Education Institutional Accreditation (NPB) became increasingly concerned that the problem of governmental intervention in higher education would worsen in the absence of a nationally recognized accreditation coordinating body. The way to prevent this from happening, according to the National Policy Board (NPB), was to create a new, stronger accrediting body responsible for coordinating the activities of the country's six regional higher education accreditors. According to the NPB,

> Higher education's best protection against intrusion in accreditation lies in establishing a new national body [tentatively named the Higher Education Institutional Accreditation Board (HEAB), and CHEA's immediate predecessor] capable of demonstrating that higher education itself can monitor and improve accreditation and protect public interest (Report of the National Policy Board on Higher Education Institutional Accreditation, 1994, p. 9).

At a June 1995 meeting organized by NPB, 80 campus chief executives, national association presidents, regional accrediting agency directors, and other higher education officials involved in the accreditation process achieved near unanimous agreement to "create a national organization or system to enhance higher education accrediting activities and create a process for certifying accrediting agencies" (National Policy Board on Higher Education Institutional Accreditation, 1995, p. 1). Participants at the meeting:

1. Expressed the need for continuation of a strong system of non-governmental, voluntary accreditation.
2. Reaffirmed support for the current regional structure of institutional accreditation.
3. Endorsed efforts by the regional agencies to move toward common institutional eligibility criteria and threshold standards for accreditation.
4. Supported the concept of presidential control over the process of developing a new entity to coordinate accrediting agencies, and over whatever entity is created.
5. Called for special focus in the new entity on problems related to specialized accreditation (pp. 5-8).

The new national accrediting entity was named the Council for Higher Education Accreditation, or CHEA. CHEA refers to its creation in March of 1996 as a "capstone event" because it was approved through the largest national referendum ever taken in American higher education. Of the 1,603 higher education institutions that participated in the vote, 94% approved the creation of CHEA (CHEA 1998b, p. 5).

In lieu of a federal government agency, CHEA is the national accrediting association that functions to coordinate and monitor the country's higher education system. It does not accredit individual institutions or academic programs. It does recognize regional accreditation associations through a formal review process. Membership in the Council includes all degree-granting colleges and universities that pay the fee for membership and are accredited by a body (i.e., a regional accrediting body) recognized by the Council. The primary role of CHEA is to "promote academic quality through formal recognition of higher education accrediting bodies and coordinate and work to advance self-regulation through accreditation" (CHEA, 1996a, p. 1). It coordinates higher education accrediting activities at the national level, evaluates regional accreditors against provisions for recognition, certifies regional accrediting agencies, and acts as a policy center and clearinghouse on accreditation.

Specifically, CHEA is responsible for the following activities:

1. Recognizing sound and effective higher education accrediting bodies.
2. Serving as a national advocate for voluntary self-regulation through accreditation.
3. Coordinating research, debate, and processes that improve accreditation.
4. Collecting and disseminating data and information about accreditation.
5. Mediating disputes and fostering communication between and among accrediting bodies and the higher education community (CHEA, 1998a, p. 1).

The North Central Association of Colleges and Schools—Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (NCA-CIHE)

The history of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) dates back to March of 1895, when 36 school, college, and university administrators from seven Midwest states met at Northwestern University, in Chicago, Illinois. The object of "the North Central States" was "the establishment of closer relations between the colleges and secondary schools of the region" (NCA, 1997c, pp. 1-2). It aimed to "improve relations between high schools and colleges by bringing together representatives from both levels to discuss matters of common concern" (Newman, 1996, p. x).

In 1909, the NCA Commission on Accredited Schools, created to oversee secondary education, adopted a set of college standards. The initial procedures for inspecting higher education institutions were borrowed from earlier accrediting efforts of national organizations, including the Carnegie Foundation, and the Association's own pre-existing procedures for dealing with secondary schools. The Commission was renamed the Commission on Accredited Schools and Colleges to reflect its new role in monitoring colleges and universities. In 1915, the Association's constitution was amended so that accreditation responsibilities were divided between the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) and the Commission on Secondary Schools (Newman, 1996).

Substantive changes in the standards took place between 1916 and 1917 as a result of the establishment of CIHE. In 1918, under a new classification system, institutions of higher learning were grouped into three different divisions—colleges and universities, junior colleges, and teacher training institutions—and a distinct set of criteria was established for each division (Davis, 1945; Zook, 1936). Eventually all three divisions would come to be judged by CIHE under the same criteria.

The call for greater flexibility in meeting unique institutional objectives led to a revision of the NCA standards in 1934. The new standards signified a change in the way NCA's policies were applied by evaluators to assess institutional effectiveness. Whereas the earlier standards focused on quantity, the new standards focused on quality. The act of switching from a philosophy of accreditation based on the achievement of a uniform set of standards to one grounded in institution-based evaluation transformed the practice of accreditation nation wide. The other five regional associations soon picked up the new approach adopted by NCA (Shawn, 1983).

At its inception, NCA was the largest of the four existing U.S. regional accrediting organizations. Today, it remains the largest of the six accreditors in terms of the number of states, community colleges, and students it serves. It recognizes all levels of education, from K-12 to colleges and universities, in 19 states, including Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. It also oversees education in the U.S. Department of Defense Dependents' Schools operated overseas for the children of American military and civilian personnel, as well as schools operated by the Navajo Nation and other Native American reservations. Whereas NCA recognizes educational institutions in 19 U.S. states, the next largest regional accreditor (the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools) recognizes educational institutions in 11 U.S. states (see Table 3).

In the fall of 1997, 968 colleges and universities were accredited by the NCA. An additional 18 institutions of higher education held NCA candidacy status (NCA-CIHE, 1997e, pp. 325-332). In 1998, 35%, or 394, of the 1,132

Table 3

States Served by U.S. Regional Higher Education Accreditors, 1998

Regional Accreditor	States Served	Total Number States Served
North Central Association of Colleges and Schools	Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming	19
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools	Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia	11
Northwest Association of Colleges and School	Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington	7
New England Association of Schools and Colleges	Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont	6
Middle States Association of Schools and Colleges	Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania	5
Western Association of Schools and Colleges	California, Hawaii	2

Source: National Center for Education Statistics. [On-line]. Available: ftp:nces.ed.gov/data/postsec/ipeds, February 23, 1998.

associate degree-granting institutions of higher education in the United States were located in the region served by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA). Of these, 87%, or 344 out of 394, were accredited by the NCA (Phone correspondence with a NCA-CIHE representative, August 8, 2000) (see Table 4).

Table 4

Number of Community Colleges by Regional Accreditor, State, and Type of Control, 1998

Regional Accreditor	State	Community College Type			
		Public	Private	Tribal	Total
North Central	Arizona	19	1	1	21
	Arkansas	22	1	0	23
	Colorado	16	1	0	17
	Illinois	49	7	0	56
	Indiana	2	2	0	4
	Iowa	17	3	0	20
	Kansas	20	4	1	25
	Michigan	28	3	1	32
	Minnesota	29	1	1	31
	Missouri	13	5	0	18
	Nebraska	7	0	2	9
	New Mexico	14	0	3	17
	North Dakota	4	6	5	15
	Ohio	35	1	0	36
	Oklahoma	17	3	0	20
	South Dakota	4	5	3	12
	West Virginia	11	1	0	12
	Wisconsin	17	1	1	19
	Wyoming	7	0	0	7
Total		331	45	18	394
Southern	Alabama	30	4	0	34
	Florida	28	4	0	32
	Georgia	26	4	0	30
	Kentucky	15	1	0	16
	Louisiana	7	0	0	7
	Mississippi	15	2	0	17
	North Carolina	58	2	0	60
	South Carolina	17	1	0	18
	Tennessee	14	7	0	21
	Texas	68	1	0	69
	Virginia	23	3	0	26
Total		301	29	0	330
New England	Connecticut	12	4	0	16
	Maine	9	1	0	10
	Massachusetts	17	11	0	28
	New Hampshire	4	4	0	8
	Rhode Island	1	1	0	2
	Vermont	2	3	0	5
Total		45	24	0	69

Northwest					
	Alaska	5	0	0	5
	Idaho	5	1	0	6
	Montana	8	0	7	15
	Nevada	4	1	0	5
	Oregon	17	0	0	17
	Utah	5	3	0	8
	Washington	33	1	1	35
Total		77	6	8	91
Middle States					
	Delaware	1	0	0	1
	Maryland	18	3	0	21
	New Jersey	19	2	0	21
	New York	47	14	0	61
	Pennsylvania	16	1	0	17
Total		101	20	0	121
Western					
	Hawaii	7	2	0	9
	California	106	11	1	118
Total		113	13	1	127
United States		968	137	27	1132

Sources: American Association of Community Colleges data files. (1998). National Center for Education Statistics. (1998).

The vastness of the NCA is further supported by the data presented in Table 5. In the Fall of 1998, 344, or 35%, of all regionally accredited community colleges in this country were accredited by the NCA. In the Fall of 1996, nearly 3 million, or 32%, of the nation's 9,229,052 community college students were enrolled at two-year colleges located in the states served by the NCA. In comparison, 2.5 million, or 27%, of the nation's community college students were enrolled in two year colleges located in the states served by the next largest regional accreditor, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Two commissions internal to the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) carry out the Association's day-to-day operations. The

Table 5

Regional Higher Education Accreditor by Number of Community Colleges, Number of Accredited Community Colleges, and Community College Student Enrollment (Full-Time and Part-Time, Full Year)

Regional Higher Education Accreditor	Community Colleges (1998)	Accredited Community Colleges (1998)	Student Enrollment (1995-96)	Percent of Total Student Enrollment
North Central Association of Colleges and Schools	394	344	2,908,801	32%
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools	330	309	2,529,721	27%
Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges	91	86	700,620	7%
New England Association of Schools and Colleges	69	61	264,145	3%
Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools	121	104	925,125	10%
Western Association of Schools and Colleges	127	124	1,900,640	21%
Total	1,132	1,028	9,229,052	100%

Source: American Association of Community Colleges data files. (1998). National Center for Education Statistic (1996). [On-line]. Available: http://www.aacc.nche.edu/anaboutcc/enrollment.num, April 4, 2000. Phone correspondence with representatives from the offices of all regional accreditors, August 8, 2000.

Commission on Schools, with regional offices in Tempe, Arizona, accredits institutions below the postsecondary degree granting level in the NCA region. The Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE), in Chicago, Illinois, accredits institutions of higher education in the NCA region. NCA-CIHE is a member institution of the country's national higher education accrediting body, CHEA.

Characteristics of NCA-Accredited Postsecondary Institutions

Until 1934, colleges and universities seeking NCA accreditation were measured against a set of standardized "norms" developed by CIHE.

> The basis for accreditation decisions became a comparison of data concerning an institution against a set of "norms" derived from data accumulated from many institutions. The "pattern" of data from the institution being evaluated was compared to a "pattern map" based on these norms, and the institution was accredited if the two patterns seemed to match (NCA-CIHE, 1997f, p. 4).

Although early CIHE accreditation norms for evaluating institutional quality (including those in the areas of faculty and teaching) evolved out of a consensus among accredited institutions, there were problems with the normative technique. As noted, the CIHE accreditation model was based on the standards and norms of four-year colleges and universities and inherently assumed the notion of standardization and similarity. In some cases, the use of this model resulted in institutions feeling pressured to conform. In other cases, institutions whose missions and purposes varied from the norm were basically eliminated from the pool of potential accreditation candidates. The earliest junior colleges in the NCA region, for example, went unaccredited because they could not meet Association accreditation standards developed from four-year college and university norms (Simmons, 1993).

As early as the 1920s, the NCA warned against the danger of "excessive rigidity in [accreditation] standards: ...by the end of the Twenties, critics charged that the standards had become roadblocks to legitimate experimentation and constructive change" (NCA-CIHE, 1997f, p. 3). Led by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE), a committee was formed in 1929 to "develop a new approach to accreditation that would allow more institutional flexibility in meeting unique institutional objectives, a consideration of overall educational effectiveness rather than an imposition of arbitrary minimum standards of acceptability" (Shawn, 1993, p. 15).

In 1934, the Association replaced "standards" with "criteria" and stated that each institution was to be judged in the light of its own self-declared purposes—as long as they were appropriate to higher education. As worded by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE),

> An institution will be judged for accreditment upon the basis of the total pattern it presents as an institution of higher education. While institutions will be judged in terms of the characteristics noted [elsewhere] in this statement of policy, it is recognized that wide variations will appear in the degree of excellence attained. It is accepted as a principle of procedure that superiority in some characteristic may be regarded as compensating, to some extent, for deficiencies in other respects. The facilities and activities of an institution will be judged in terms of the purposes it seeks to serve. (North Central Association Quarterly, 1934, p. 41).

As noted in the NCA-CIHE Handbook of Accreditation, 1994-96 (1997f), the philosophy exposed by CIHE in 1934 forms the basis of the NCA accreditation process as conducted by the Commission today.

> An institution should be judged on the basis of the total pattern it presents...It is accepted as a principle of procedure that superiority in some characteristic may be regarded as compensating, to some extent, for deficiencies in other respects...an institution will be judged in terms of the purposes it seeks to serve [i.e., its mission] (pp. 3-4).

The face of postsecondary education drastically changed in the 1960s and 1970s when community colleges, vocational/technical institutes, and specialized institutions assumed an increasing role in the American system of higher education. The Commission responded to this change by adopting a "set of conditions for eligibility" in the early 70's. These conditions described the kinds of colleges and universities the Association would consider for accreditation. In 1981, the Commission adopted the Criteria for Accreditation. In 1987, the Commission reformulated its General Institutional Requirements (GIRs), which define the essential characteristics expected of all NCA-affiliated institutions. CIHE periodically reviews the Criteria for Accreditation and GIRs through a consultative process involving all member institutions and based on common expectations for institutional performance and measures of institutional quality and effectiveness (NCA-CIHE, 1997f).

In 1991-92, the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) initiated a significant reexamination of its policies, procedures, requirements, criteria, and mission through the report of its Committee on Critical Issues. The recommendations of the Committee were reviewed by the Commission, and distributed to the member institutions for review and comment in Spring of 1992. In February 1993, CIHE published the revised Criteria for Accreditation and GIRs, including those regarding faculty, full- and part-time. This reexamination and revision "resulted in the first major restructuring of the [NCA-CIHE] Handbook of Accreditation in more than ten years" (NCA-CIHE, 1997f, p. 4). The Criteria for Accreditation and GIRs serve as the basis for the NCA accreditation process as it is currently conducted by CIHE.

In order to understand the NCA higher education accreditation process as carried out by CIHE, it is important to understand the Criteria for Accreditation and General Institutional Requirements (GIRs), and the relationship between the two. The discussion now turns to these topics.

Criteria for Accreditation

The CIHE Criteria for Accreditation cover 5 broad areas for evaluating institutional effectiveness, including: (a) mission statement and purpose; (b) human, financial, and physical resources; (c) educational purpose; (d) educational effectiveness; and, (e) integrity in practices and relationships. Colleges and universities seeking accreditation are required to meet all criteria under the 5 areas. And, although institutions are judged holistically, “Outstanding performance in an area covered by one Criterion does not compensate for unacceptable performance in another “ (NCA-CIHE, 1997f, p. 30).

Institutions affiliated with the Commission are expected to provide an overall pattern of evidence in support of each Criterion. Patterns of Evidence “provide formally-approved lists of typical areas of institutional activity or concern (‘indicators’) that relate directly to the satisfaction of each Criterion” (NCA-CIHE, 1997f, 42). The indicators help an institution identify issues and concerns common to all higher education institutions, and function to aide Evaluation Teams in determining whether an institution satisfies each

Criterion. The existence of indicators supports NCA-CIHE's strong belief that more than one way exists by which to measure whether an institution has met accreditation criteria:

> These indicators [e.g., Patterns of Evidence] are not "checklists," nor are they exhaustive; they are broad descriptions of the kind of concerns and issues the Commission considers when making a holistic decision on each criterion. Not every indicator will be critical for every institution; many institutions include additional indicators of their success in fulfilling the criteria (NCA-CIHE, 1997f, p. 1).

Criterion Two directly relates to the evaluation of an institution's faculty. It addresses the effectiveness of human, financial, and physical resources: "The institution has effectively organized the human, financial, and physical resources necessary to accomplish its purposes" (NCA-CIHE, 1997f, 39). In determining appropriate patterns of evidence for this Criterion as it relates to an institutions' faculty, the CIHE considers whether an institution employs "faculty with educational credentials that testify to appropriate preparation for the courses they teach" (see Table 6). (See Appendix D for a list and description of all Criteria for Accreditation and related Patterns of Evidence.)

General Institutional Requirements (GIRs)

General Institutional Requirements (GIRs) establish a foundation within the accreditation process. They define the broadest parameters of the universe of institutions of higher education that can choose to hold affiliation status with the Commission. They establish a threshold of institutional development needed by an institution seeking to affiliate with the

Table 6

NCA-CIHE Criterion Two and Patterns of Evidence

Criterion Two: The institution has effectively organized the human, financial, and physical resources necessary to accomplish its purposes.

In determining appropriate patterns of evidence for this criterion, the Commission considers evidence such as:

1. Governance by a board consisting of informed people who understand their responsibilities, function in accordance with stated board policies, and have the resolve necessary to preserve the institution's integrity.
2. Effective administration through well-defined and understood organizational structures, policies, and procedures.
3. Qualified and experienced administrative personnel who oversee institutional activities and exercise appropriate responsibility for them.
4. Systems of governance that provide dependable information to the institution's constituencies and, as appropriate, involve them in the decision-making processes.
5. Faculty with educational credentials that testify to appropriate preparation for the courses they teach.
6. A sufficient number of students enrolled to meet the institution's stated educational purposes.
7. Provision of services that afford all admitted students the opportunity to succeed.
8. A physical plant that supports effective teaching and learning.
9. Conscientious efforts to provide students with a safe and healthy environment.
10. Academic resources and equipment (e.g., libraries, electronic services and products, learning resource centers, laboratories and studios, computers) adequate to support the institution's purposes.
11. A pattern of financial expenditures that shows the commitment to provide both the environment and the human resources necessary for effective teaching and learning.
12. Management of financial resources to maximize the institution's capability to meet its purposes.

Source: NCA-CIHE. (1997). Handbook of Accreditation, 1994-96 (2nd edition). Chicago, IL: Author, pp. 39-42.

Commission. They reflect the Commission's basic expectations of all member institutions of higher education whether they hold candidacy or accreditation status (NCA-CIHE, 1997f).

Twenty-four GIRs fall under seven broad areas, including mission statement, legal authorization, governance, faculty, educational programs, finances, and public information. GIR numbers 9, 10, and 11 describe the threshold educational requirements for an institution's faculty. All of an institution's faculty— full- and part-time faculty, and faculty at its home campus and those at other instructional sites—are included in judging these requirements. Table 7 lists and describes only those GIRs specifically related to an institution's faculty. (See Appendix E for a list and description of all GIRs.)

The Commission provides a full explanation of its expectation for each GIR through an accompanying explication. The explications clarify GIRs to assist institutions in understanding the Commission's basic expectations of all affiliated colleges and universities. They also assist Evaluation Teams in making judgments about whether an institution satisfactorily meets the threshold of institutional development required to be affiliated with NCA.

For example, GIR # 11 requires that an institution's faculty "has [sic] a significant role in developing and evaluating all of the institution's educational programs." The explication states:

> This GIR speaks to the role faculty (as defined by GIRs 9 and 10) must play in the design and evaluation of educational programs. Faculty not only provide instruction and advise students, but also are involved in

> institutional governance and operations through their work on committees and other institutional processes.
>
> Typically, faculty develop curricula, approve all curricular offerings of the institution, and establish ways to evaluate the effectiveness and currency of the curricula. They are responsible for the quality of off-campus as well as on-campus offerings. Through clearly defined structures, faculty and administrators exercise oversight for all educational offerings (NCA-CIHE, 1997f, pp. 22-23).

(See Appendix F for a list and description of all General Institutional Requirements [GIRs] and related explications regarding part-time faculty.)

Table 7

NCA-CIHE General Institutional Requirements (GIRs) for Faculty

---

An institution affiliated with the [NCA] Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools meets these General Institutional Requirements.

GIR 9: It employs a faculty that has earned from accredited institutions and degrees appropriate to the level of instruction offered by the institution.

GIR 10: A sufficient number of the faculty are full-time employees of the institution.

GIR 11: Its faculty has a significant role in developing and evaluating all of the institution's educational programs.

Source: NCA-CIHE. (1997). Handbook of Accreditaiton, 1994-96 (2nd edition). Chicago, IL: Author, pp. 21-22.

The Relationship Between Criteria for Accreditation and General Institutional Requirements (GIRs)

The Commission's General Institutional Requirements (GIRs) establish a foundation within the accreditation process, describing the primary requirements for affiliation with the Commission. The Criteria for Accreditation constitute the frame and structure built on the foundation. Each Criterion is related to one or more GIRs, but each goes beyond the basic expectation of the GIRs (NCA-CIHE, 1997f). For example, GIR # 9 calls for the employment of faculty that has earned degrees from accredited institutions that are appropriate to the level of instruction delivered by the institution. Criterion Two asks if "The institution has effectively organized the human, financial, and physical resources necessary to accomplish its purposes" (see Table 8).

A candidate institution, or an institution seeking reaccreditation, may meet the GIRs yet fail to achieve affiliation with the NCA-Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) because it did not satisfactorily fulfill the required Criteria for Accreditation. The Commission's programs for candidacy and for accreditation require that the institution under consideration for membership meet the GIRs and fulfill the Criteria for Accreditation.

The items regarding the amount of difficulty experienced in meeting accreditation criteria for part-time faculty on the questionnaire used to measure the perceptions of Chief Instructional Officers (CIOs) in this study were developed from the CIHE's Criteria for Accreditation and GIRs and supporting Patterns of Evidence and explications.

Table 8

The Relationship Between GIRs and Criteria for Accreditation

Criterion for Accreditation	General Institutional Requirements
Criterion One	GIRs # 1, 2, 3, 4, 12, 14
Criterion Two	GIRs # 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21
Criterion Three	GIRs # 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20
Criterion Four	Almost all GIRs relate to this Criterion
Criterion Five	GIRs # 3, 6, 8, 17, 22, 23, 24

Source: NCA-CIHE. (1997). Handbook of Accreditation, 1994-96 (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: Author, pp. 27-28.

Diversity Among American Community Colleges

At the March 10, 2000 Ohio Assessment Forum in Columbus, Ohio, Dr. Stephen Spangehl, staff liaison to nearly 200 NCA-accredited colleges and universities, announced the new NCA Academic Quality Improvement Project (AQIP), a three-year grant-funded effort—funded by the PEW Charitable Trusts—to develop a new customer-focused reaccreditation process based on quality improvement principles, techniques, and tools. He identified a major distinction between the traditional NCA accreditation process as carried out by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) and the AQIP. The current accreditation process is based on the philosophy that an institution is to be judged "in light of its own self-declared purposes, as long as these [are] appropriate to a higher education institution" (NCA-CIHE, 1997f, p. 4). It focuses on internal improvement: "how did we improve since last time" [i.e., since the last accreditation visit]. The AQIP, on the other hand, does require institutions to focus on internal improvement, but, according to Dr. Spangehl, also encourages institutions to answer the question, "how do we stack-up against other institutions like ours?"

The idea of involving external comparison in the institutional accreditation process is truly new to the philosophy of the NCA-CIHE which has prided itself on evaluating colleges and universities against their own mission and purposes. Millard (1983) accurately summarized the traditional philosophy behind the institutional accreditation process:

> Since most institutions are accredited and no differentiation is made among accredited institutions, accreditation is of little value as a guide to qualitative differentiation even among institutions with comparable objectives...Accreditation is not designed to provide comparative ratings. In fact, if it did it would lose much of its effectiveness. The crucial question for accreditation is not how one institution or program compares with another but how effectively the institution or program meets it own educational objectives. In this sense accreditation is institution or program specific and is unlike, for example, statewide program review in public institutions, which is primarily related to allocation of resources and statewide planning (p. 35).

The NCA-CIHE (2000b) formerly unveiled its Academic Quality Improvement Project (AQIP) in April of 2000. One of the 10 guiding values of the AQIP is collaboration:

> The quality-driven institution encourages active collaboration among and within internal departments and operational areas, and, externally, between the institution and other institutions or

> organizations. It removes internal barriers to collaboration, such as the constraints individuals often experience within a hierarchical chain of command or when they find themselves working for a sub-unit rather than a larger organization. The institution promotes shared support for a common mission among its faculty, staff, and administrators by providing them with the training and resources successful collaboration demands. It rewards effective cooperation and celebrates model collaborative efforts with internal and external partners (p. 4).

Currently, participation in the Academic Quality Improvement Project (AQIP) is voluntary. NCA-accredited institutions may elect to utilize the Project as an alternative model of accreditation and/or a means to reaffirm continuing accreditation (NCA-CIHE, 2000b). In comparing the traditional reaccreditation process and AQIP, NCA-CIHE (2000b) notes that "the components of the new accreditation model—the Quality Criteria, the processes, and the AQIP services that support the model—differ significantly from NCA's traditional approach to accreditation" (p. 3). As previously discussed, one of the major differences between the new accreditation model and the traditional accreditation model is found in the role of like institutions in the accreditation process. Whereas the traditional accreditation model focuses on judging each institution "in light of its own self-declared purposes" (NCA-CIHE, 1997f, p. 4), the philosophy of the AQIP process strongly suggests that like institutions rely on one another for information and comparative data to achieve a systematic approach to continuous quality improvement.

In order to effectively interact with peer institutions, and subsequently benefit from those interactions, there needs to be a system in place for identifying peer institutions. To date, however, there is no nationally recognized comprehensive system for classifying community colleges for the purpose of comparison. Thus, there is no generally recognized source of reference for community colleges to identify institutions like themselves. There are nationally recognized systems for classifying American institutions of higher education. However, as the evidence will show, none of these schemes successfully captures the rich diversity that exists among the country's two-year colleges.

Clark Kerr developed the most widely known and accepted classification scheme for institutions of higher education for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (CFAT), Commission on Higher Education in 1973. The 1973 edition of the Carnegie Classification System of Institutions of Higher Education provided the first comprehensive classification scheme for four-year colleges based on institutional focus, federal dollars awarded, highest level of degree awarded, and selective nature of admissions offered. However, it failed to acknowledge diversity among community colleges, instead lumping them together in one category, namely "Two-Year Colleges and Institutions."

The Carnegie system was revised between 1973 and 1976 and between 1976 and 1987: No changes affecting the two-year college category were made in either case (see Table 9). However, a major change affecting two-year colleges occurred when the system was revised again in 1994: The title of the category for two-year colleges was changed from "Two-year Colleges and

Table 9

The Carnegie Classification System of Institutions of Higher Education by Major Category and SubCategory, 1973 and 1987

1973 Major Category Subcategory	1987 Major Category Subcategory
Doctoral-Granting Institutions	Doctoral Granting Institutions
Research Universities I	Research Universities I
Research Universities II	Research University II
Doctoral-Granting Universities I	Doctoral-Granting Universities I
Doctoral-Granting Universities II	Doctoral-Granting Universities II
Comprehensive Colleges & Universities	Comprehensive Colleges & Universities
Comprehensive Colleges & Universities I	Comprehensive Colleges & Universities I
Comprehensive Colleges & Universities II	Comprehensive Colleges & Universities II
Liberal Arts Colleges	Liberal Arts Colleges
Liberal Arts Colleges I	Liberal Arts Colleges I
Liberal Arts Colleges II	Liberal Arts Colleges II
Two-Year Colleges & Institutions	Two-Year Colleges & Institutions
Professional Schools & Other	Specialized Institutions
Specialized Institutions	
Theological Schools	Medical Schools
Medical Schools	Other Health Professions
Other Separate Health Professional Schools	Teachers
	Engineering & Technology
Schools of Business & Management	Business & Management
Schools of Art, Music & Design	Arts, Music, & Design
Schools of Law	Theological
Teacher's Colleges	Law
Other Specialized Institutions (e.g., Maritime Institutions)	Corporate Colleges Other Specialized

Sources: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1976,1987). A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. (A Carnegie Technical Report. Princeton, NJ: University Press.

Institutions" to "Associate of Arts Colleges". This is an important point considering that some two-year colleges do not award associate of arts degrees, namely two-year technical colleges. It appears that these types of institutions were virtually eliminated from the Carnegie system between 1987 and 1994 (see Table 10). Further, despite the fact that two-year colleges represented the largest major category in terms of number of institutions and student enrollment in both raw numbers and percentage of total in 1994 (see Table 11), no subcategories were developed for the 1994 revision to distinguish two-year colleges by institutional type. In short, the Carnegie classifications promote the unsubstantiated assumption that two-year colleges are homogeneous, rather than provide a more realistic picture depicting institutional diversity.

According to Priscilla Milam (1995), the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, headed by Clark Kerr, developed its first classification categories in 1973 to "improve the quality and precision of their [sic] research" (p. 39). However, in 1994, the same classification scheme that thrice underwent review categorized all 1,471 two-year colleges under one group. She concluded that although the Carnegie Classification System is "meaningful for those institutions who were well suited in their positions, [it] has little meaning for the two-year colleges" (p. 44).

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching recently announced a plan to revise its system for classifying institutions of higher education. In May of 1998, Lee Shulman, president of the Foundation,

Table 10

The Carnegie Classification System of Institutions of Higher Education by Major Category and Subcategory, 1987 and 1994

1987 Major Category Subcategory	1994 Major Category Subcategory
Doctoral-Granting Institutions	Doctoral Granting Institutions
Research Universities I	Research Universities I
Research Universities II	Research University II
Doctoral-Granting Universities I	Doctoral-Granting Universities I
Doctoral-Granting Universities II	Doctoral-Granting Universities II
Comprehensive Colleges & Universities	Master's Colleges & Universities
Comprehensive Colleges & Universities I	Master's Colleges & Universities I
Comprehensive Colleges & Universities II	Master's Colleges & Universities II
Liberal Arts Colleges	Baccalaureate Colleges
Liberal Arts Colleges I	Baccalaureate Colleges I
Liberal Arts Colleges II	Baccalaureate Colleges II
Two-Year Colleges & Institutions	Associate of Arts Colleges
Specialized Institutions	Specialized Institutions
Medical Schools	
Other Health Professions	Tribal Colleges & Universities
Teachers	
Engineering and Technology	
Business and Management	
Arts, Music, and Design	
Theological	
Law	
Corporate Colleges	
Other Specialized	

Source: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1987,1994). A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. (A Carnegie Technical Report. Princeton, NJ: University Press.

Table 11

Number and Higher Education Institutions and Their Student Enrollment by Type and Control, 1994

Type of Institution Subcategory	Number of Institutions				Enrollment			
	Total	Public	Private	% of Total	Total	Public	Private	% of Total
Doctoral Granting Institutions	236	151	85	6.6	3,981	3,111	869	26.1
Research Universities I	88	59	29	2.5	2,030	1,652	379	13.3
Research University II	37	26	11	1.0	641	488	153	4.2
Doctoral-Granting Universities I	51	28	23	1.4	658	467	191	4.3
Doctoral-Granting Universities II	60	38	22	1.7	651	505	147	4.3
Master's Colleges & Universities	529	275	254	14.7	3,139	2,291	848	20.6
Master's Colleges & Universities I	435	249	186	12.1	2,896	2,177	719	19.0
Master's Colleges & Universities II	94	26	68	2.6	243	114	129	1.6
Baccalaureate Colleges	637	86	551	17.7	1,053	275	777	6.9
Baccalaureate Colleges I	166	7	159	4.6	268	20	248	1.8
Baccalaureate Colleges II	471	79	392	13.1	784	255	529	5.1
Associate of Arts Colleges	1,471	963	508	40.9	6,527	6,234	292	42.8
Specialized Institutions	693	72	621	19.3	548	145	404	3.6
Tribal Colleges & Universities	29	29	0	0.8	15	15	0	0.1
Total	3,595	1,576	2,019	100.00	15,263	12,072	3,191	100.00

Sources: Enrollment figures are adapted from the U.S. National Center for Education Statistics data by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. [On-line]. Available: http://www. Carnegiefoundation.org/cihe/ table4.htm, April 10, 2000.

Note: Enrollments are rounded to the nearest one thousand.

*Figure excludes institutions with unavailable enrollment figures.

announced its plan to overhaul the "Carnegie Classification" ("Carnegie Foundation to overhaul its college classification system…," 1998). The new system will be released in two "steps" over the next five years. The first step, called the "Millennial Plan," is scheduled for release in 2000 and will closely resemble the system now in place. The second step, the "Centennial Plan" will be released in 2005. According to Alexander C. McCormick, a senior scholar at Carnegie who is leading the revision effort, "The [revised] system could place colleges in a broader array of categories, reflecting different characteristics of institutions. Colleges could be measured in all of the categories to give a fuller picture of their missions" (Lively, 1999, p. A46). Similar to the previous schemes, however, the proposed changes to the Carnegie classification system fail to recognize the diversity found among two-year colleges. To date, the only change to the two-year college category planned for the 2000 revision is a name change from "Associate of Arts Colleges" to "Associate's Colleges" (Basinger, 2000, p. 42).

In short, the Carnegie system for classifying institutions of higher education has failed to identify a subclassification category that clearly recognizes distinct community college types since its inception in 1973. Community college researchers find little use for this system because it fails to yield data that can be used to identify and study the rich diversity that exists among community colleges. Instead, and increasingly, researchers interested in examining and comparing community colleges have turned to other classification schemes, including those developed by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), the National Center on Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), and the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). Each of these classification schemes, however, poses problems similar to those associated with the Carnegie system. NCES lumps all two-year institutions into one category thereby failing to recognize any differences between community college types. The only criteria used by NCHEMS to identify community college subcategories is degree completion (see Table 12).

Although the AACC system for classifying community colleges comes closer to recognizing institutional distinctiveness, it simply segregates categories based on type of governance (see Table 13). Additionally, as noted by Katsinas & Lacey (1996), the AACC classifications do not distinguish between institutions on the basis of geography. This is an important point considering the availability of empirical evidence that supports the proposition that community college administrators and faculty struggle with different issues and face different problems based on the location of their institutions (Katsinas & Lacey, 1996; Killacky & Valadez, 1995; Milam, 1995; Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1995; Scheibmeir, 1980).

The American Association of Community Colleges has acknowledged institutional diversity in some of their research reports (AACC, 1997b, 1998b). In these cases, data were categorized by institutional type (single campus, main campus of multi-campus college, campus of multi-campus college, campus of multi-college district, university campus offering two-year programs, district office), type of control (public, independent, and tribal), location (urban, suburban, rural, and not classified), and even size, (fewer that 1,000 students to more than 7,500 students). However, it is important to note that inclusion in one category versus another was typically determined

Table 12

National Center for Education Management System's (NCHEMS) Categories of Institutions of Higher Education, 1982

Major Category

- Subcategory

- Major Doctoral-Granting Institutions
    - Major Research Institutions
    - Other Major Doctoral Institutions
- Comprehensive Institutions
- General Baccalaureate Institutions
- Professional and Specialized Institutions
    - Divinity Institutions
    - Medical Institutions
    - Other Health Institutions
    - Engineering Schools
    - Business and Management Schools
    - Art, Music, and Design Schools
    - Law Schools
    - Education Schools
    - Other Specialized or Professional Schools
    - U.S. Service Schools
- Two-Year Institutions
    - Comprehensive Two-Year Institutions
    - Academic Two-Year Institutions
    - Multi-Program Occupational Two Year Institutions

Source: Makowski, D. & Wulfsberg, R. M. (1982). An improved taxonomy of postsecondary institutions. Report No. HE 017 555. Washington, D. C. National Institute of Educational Policy and Organization.

Table 13

The American Association of Community Colleges Classification System, by Type of Governance

---

Multi-College Districts
Colleges Within Multi-College Districts
Multi-Campus Colleges
Campuses of Multi-Campus Colleges
University Branch Campuses Offering the Associate Degree
Single Institutions

Source: American Association of Community Colleges cited in S.G. Katsinas. (1993, p. 2). Toward a classification system for community colleges. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Council of Universities and Colleges, Portland, Oregon. ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED 377 925.

by self-reports; Participants in the research determined their own classification then reported it. It is also important to note that these categories have not been consistently applied in all reports published by the American Association of Community Colleges.

The importance of developing and utilizing a nationally recognized comprehensive system for classifying community colleges is reinforced by the findings of research on the topic of part-time faculty. Studies on the status of part-time faculty at community colleges have found considerable differences between community college types. Murphy (1980) found a significant difference, at the .05 level of confidence, among community college districts regarding the level of policy incentives for part-time faculty, part-time faculty job satisfaction, and employment patterns of part-time faculty. Scheibmeir (1980) found that there were significantly fewer part-timers in rural community colleges than community colleges in urban settings and that wealthier college districts relied most heavily on part-time faculty. Based on an analysis of U.S. Department of Education IPEDS data (1990-91 year), Milam (1995) found significant differences regarding access to part-time faculty between rural, suburban, and urban community colleges.

Based on the results of a national study on the utilization of part-time faculty by American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) member institutions, Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron (1995) found that the level of reliance on part-time faculty varied among colleges, primarily because of their size: "...large colleges and districts are more likely than small or average colleges to employ higher percentages of part-time faculty" (p. 28). Further, they found that part-time faculty recruitment strategies varied among colleges, primarily because of their location: "Colleges operating in large, urban areas had fewer reasons [than those operating in small, rural areas] to be concerned with adequate numbers or specialized training and experiences in part-time faculty pools" (p. 47).

According to Katsinas & Lacey (1996),

> A lack of precision exists regarding the identification of two-year institutions in the United States. This lack of precision has inhibited the general understanding of the diversity among and between public, private, and proprietary two-year institutions regarding their missions, functions, curricula, students, and faculty (p. 11).

The Katsinas & Lacey (1996) Community College Classification

System offers a comprehensive system for categorizing like, and dislike, associate degree-granting colleges. The first draft of the classification scheme was based on data gathered from site visits conducted at 92 community colleges between 1986 and 1993 by Dr. Stephen G. Katsinas. Katsinas' first presented the model to the 1993 Annual Meeting of the Council of Universities and Colleges (CUC), held in Portland, Oregon in 1993. This presentation was later accepted for publication in the ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges archive. After a number of revisions, the classification scheme was the focal point of an article titled "Preparing leaders for diverse institutional settings" that was published in a 1996 New Directions for Community Colleges monograph.

In his paper Katsinas argued that significant differences exist among the nation's community, junior, and technical colleges. These differences, he contended, could be understood in terms of geography, special intended use or functional mission, governance, and control. He presented 14 "distinctive and identifiable types of community colleges worthy of being grouped together" (p. 10). Katsinas' 1993 classification system is presented in Table 14.

Based on feedback from the higher education community, and the help of Vincent A. Lacey, the original classification system underwent review six times. Katsinas & Laceys' (1996) final version is built on three major categories and 11 subcategories based on the consideration of three factors: type of control (public, private, and federally chartered/special use), location

Table 14

Katsinas' Typology of Institutionally Distinctive Community Colleges by Geographic Location and Type, 1993.

By Geographic Location	
	Rural
	Suburban
	Urban/Inner City
	Metropolitan Area District (Centralized & Decentralized)
	Adjacent to a Residential University
	Mix
By Type of Special Use	
	Hispanic-Serving
	Historically Black Two-Year Colleges
	Tribally Controlled Community Colleges
	Technical Only
	Transfer/General Education Only
By Type of Governance	
	Single Campus Governing Board
	Multi-Campus Governing Board (> 1 campus reporting without system CEO to single governing board)
	Multi-Campus Governing Board (> 1 campus reporting to a system CEO to single governing board)
	Multi-Campus, Multi-Level, Decentralized
	Multi-Campus, Multi-Level, Centralized
	Community College as Directly Administered College at a University
By Type of Control	
	Public
	Private, Non-Profit
	Private, Proprietary

Source: Katsinas, S.G. (1993). Toward a classification system for community colleges. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Council of Universities and Colleges, Portland, OR. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED 377925).

(public rural, suburban, and urban), and size (rural small, medium, and large) (see Table 15).

Katsinas & Lacey (1996) developed an effective model for conceptualizing and understanding the great diversity that exists among American two-year colleges. The Community College Classification System promotes the use of a systematic process for organizing and categorizing different types of community colleges for comparison purposes. It provides researchers interested in studying two-year colleges with a readily available tool for organizing data by institutional type. Further, it supports the goals of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools-Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (NCA-CIHE) Academic Quality Improvement Process (AQIP). At the March 10, 2000 Ohio Assessment Forum in Columbus, Ohio, Dr. Stephen Spangehl, Director of the AQIP, noted that institutions who choose to utilize this alternative model for accreditation must answer the question "How do we stack-up against institutions like our own?" When preparing a self-study document, community colleges seeking accreditation or reaccreditation can simply refer to the Katsinas & Lacey classification scheme to classify themselves and identify institutions "like themselves." Subsequently, like-institutions may engage in dialogue to gather information that will help them answer the question posed by Dr. Spangehl.

Table 15

The Katsinas & Lacey Community College Classification System, 1996

I. Publicly Controlled Two-Year Institutions

  A. Rural Community Colleges- located outside of metropolitan areas of 100 largest U.S. cities

    1. Small Colleges (FTE < 1,000 students)
    2. Medium-Sized Colleges (FTE = 1,000- 2,499 students)
    3. Large-Sized Colleges (FTE > 2,500)

  B. Suburban Community Colleges- located within metropolitan areas of 100 largest U.S. cities

    4. Single Campus
    5. Multi-Campus

  C. Urban Community Colleges: located within 100 largest U.S. cities

    6. Single Campus
    7. Multi-Campus

II. Privately Controlled Two-Year Institutions

    8. Private, Non-Profit
    9. Proprietary

III. Federally Chartered and Special Use Institutions

    10. Tribal Colleges
    11. Special Use Institutions

Source: Katsinas, S. G., & Lacey, V. A. (1996). A classification of community colleges in the United States: A technical report prepared for The Ford Foundation Education and Culture Program Grant Number 930-579, p. 60. [unpublished document].

Summary

The practice of employing part-time faculty for the delivery of instruction at two-year colleges has been at the center of discussions in academe for over 100 years. Until the late 1980s and early 1990s, the discussions typically focused on the perceived problems associated with their use. In the absence of empirical data to support the contention that employing part-time faculty poses more harm than good, discussions on the topic began to focus on strengthening the practice rather than the perceived problems associated with it.

Institutional accrediting bodies address perceived concerns regarding the negative impact of employing part-time faculty on instructional quality through the use of guidelines for employing faculty. Accreditors include measures of quality faculty and effective teaching in their overall evaluations of colleges and universities. The Council for Higher Education (CHEA), which coordinates higher education accrediting activities at the national level, and the country's six regional accreditors (and the nine commissions internal to them) have developed general standards regarding the use of part-time faculty at member institutions.

The North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) is by far the largest regional higher education accrediting body, and represents the focus of this investigation. The Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) conducts the NCA postsecondary accreditation process. The Commission established Criteria for Accreditation and General

Institutional Requirements (GIRs) to define the essential characteristics expected of all NCA-affiliated institutions, including standards for employing faculty both full- and part-time. In 1992, CIHE initiated a significant reexamination of Criteria for Accreditation and GIRs, including those regarding faculty, which resulted in the first major restructuring of the NCA-CIHE accreditation handbook in more than ten years. Although member institutions participated in the review and evaluation of the Commission's accreditation standards, no attempts have been made to examine the implementation of these standards from the eyes of administrators at NCA-accredited community colleges.

In the past, the NCA-CIHE prided itself on evaluating colleges and universities against their own mission and purpose. However, new to the philosophy of the NCA-CIHE is the idea of involving external comparison in the institutional accreditation process. The NCA-CIHE (2000b) formerly unveiled its Academic Quality Improvement Project (AQIP) in April of 2000. Whereas the traditional accreditation model focuses on judging each institution "in light of its own self-declared purposes" (NCA-CIHE, 1997f, p. 4), the philosophy of the AQIP process strongly suggests that like institutions rely on one another for information and comparative data to achieve a systematic approach to continuous quality improvement.

A thorough review of the literature revealed that the Katsinas & Lacey (1996) Community College Classification System is an appropriate tool for organizing and making comparisons among community college types in an effort to identify institutions similar to and different from one another. The data in this study were organized by institutional type as defined by the Katsinas & Lacey (1996) Community College Classification System.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

Introduction

The primary purpose of this study was to identify and describe the perceptions of chief instructional officers (CIOs) at community colleges accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) regarding the NCA-Commission on Institutions of Higher Education's (CIHE) Criteria for Accreditation and General Institutional Requirements (GIRs) for part-time faculty. Specifically, CIOs were asked to identify the amount of difficulty experienced in meeting regional accreditation criteria for part-time faculty.

There were three secondary purposes of the study, including: (a) to identify and describe the perceptions of CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges regarding the amount of challenge experienced in implementing practices for effectively employing and utilizing part-time faculty; (b) to identify and describe the perceptions of CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges regarding the amount of influence commonly cited reasons for employing part-time faculty have on the decision to employ part-time faculty; and, (c) to compare differences in the data by community college type based on type of control (public, private, federally chartered/special use), location (public rural, suburban, urban), and size (rural small, medium, and large).

Research Questions

The research questions addressed in this study included the following:

Primary Research Questions

1. Do CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges perceive meeting accreditation criteria for part-time faculty as difficult?

   a. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of difficulty in meeting CIHE accreditation criteria for part-time faculty among CIOs at public, private, and federally chartered/special use NCA-accredited community colleges?

   b. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of difficulty in meeting CIHE accreditation criteria for part-time faculty among CIOs at rural, suburban, and urban public NCA-accredited community colleges?

   c. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of difficulty in meeting CIHE accreditation criteria for part-time faculty among CIOs at small, medium, and large rural NCA-accredited community colleges?

Secondary Research Questions

2. Do CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges perceive implementing commonly cited practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty as challenging?

   a. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of challenge in implementing commonly cited practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty among CIOs at public, private, and federally chartered/special use NCA-accredited community colleges?

    b. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of challenge in implementing commonly cited practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty among CIOs at rural, suburban, and urban public NCA-accredited community colleges?
    c. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of challenge in implementing commonly cited practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty among CIOs at small, medium, and large rural NCA-accredited community colleges?
2. Do CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges perceive commonly cited reasons for employing part-time faculty as influential on the decision to employ part-time faculty?
    a. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of influential reasons for employing part-time faculty among CIOs at public, private, and federally chartered/special use NCA-accredited community colleges?
    b. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of influential reasons for employing part-time faculty among CIOs at rural, suburban, and urban public NCA-accredited community colleges?
    c. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of influential reasons for employing part-time faculty among CIOs at small, medium, and large rural NCA-accredited community colleges?

This chapter includes the components of the research process used to accomplish the purposes of the study and to answer the research questions. It is divided into the following sections: (a) research design; (b) definition and selection of the population; (c) instrumentation; (d) data collection procedures; (e) data analysis; and, (f) chapter summary.

Research Design

The design of an investigation begins with the selection of a topic, which becomes the focus of the study (Cresswell, 1994). The primary focus of this study was the North Central Association (NCA) accreditation process as carried out by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) to assess the use of part-time faculty at accredited community colleges. This study also examined the perceptions of chief instructional officers (CIOs) regarding the implementation of effective practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty and the influence of reasons for employing part-time faculty on the decision to employ part-time faculty.

Some studies combine both research questions and hypotheses; others contain solely research questions. Questions without hypotheses are appropriate for research that is exploratory in nature (Rudestam & Newton, 1992). The question form is fitting where prior research is limited and the researcher, because of this fact, has limited expectations as to what the data will reveal (Locke, Spirduso, & Silverman, 1993). Given the exploratory nature of the research, coupled with a lack of available information on the topic, this study posed research questions rather than hypotheses to guide the direction of the data collection and analysis.

This study was descriptive in nature and employed a survey research design to collect data from an entire population. The survey design provides a quantitative or numeric description of the population through the data collection process of asking questions of people (Fowler, 1992). It is an effective tool for collecting data in descriptive, explanatory, and exploratory studies (Rudestam & Newton, 1992). According to Babbie (1998), survey research is probably the best method available to the researcher interested in collecting original data for describing a population too large to observe directly.

Surveys are an excellent vehicle for measuring perceptions (Dillman, 1978). This study assessed the perceptions of chief instructional officers (CIOs) at the 340 community colleges accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA). The perceptions of participants were quantified in terms of their responses to items on a questionnaire developed by the researcher.

After considering a number of options for conducting a survey, the researcher determined that the self-administered mail questionnaire was both appropriate and more convenient, efficient, and economical than other forms of the survey research design, namely the face-to-face interview and the telephone interview.

Definition and Selection of Population

The population selected for this study was chief instructional officers (CIOs) at two-year colleges accredited by the NCA. CIOs were chosen as the study population because they were the most competent to answer the survey questions designed to measure the perceptions in this study. They were also the most likely of all community college administrators to be involved in administering day-to-day activities involving faculty, both full- and part-time (Johns, 1993), and, subsequently, were the people most frequently and heavily involved in assessing faculty criteria for NCA-associated self-study and institutional accreditation processes.

Due to the relatively small number of subjects in the study population (i.e., a population of 340 chief instructional officers), no advantage was found in surveying a random sample over the utilization of the population. NCA-accredited community colleges, were identified using the Association's Fall 1997 Directory of Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) Affiliated Institutions. As of November 14, 1997, 340 community colleges were accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA-CIHE, 1997e, pp. 165-325). The Katsinas & Lacey (1996) Community College Classification System provided a comprehensive scheme for classifying two-year colleges by type. This scheme was used to identify and assign an institutional type code, numbers 1 through 11, for each of the 340 NCA-accredited community colleges. (See Appendix B to review the Katsinas & Lacey Community College Classification System.)

The researcher cross-referenced the 1999 Higher Education Directory (Rodenhouse & Torregrosa, 1998) to ascertain the names of the person holding the highest academic office at each of the 340 two-year colleges in the population. This position was identified in the Directory by the number 5. The number 5 category defined the highest-ranking academic officer as the person who "directs the academic program of the institution," and who is the administrative officer involved in "academic planning, teaching, research, extensions, and coordination of interdepartmental affairs" (p. xxvii).

The title "chief instructional officer" (CIO) refers to the population in this study. As identified in the 1999 Higher Education Directory, NCA-accredited community colleges commonly referred to the highest academic officer as, chief instructional officer, chief academic officer, provost, vice chancellor for academic affairs, vice chancellor for instruction, vice president for academic affairs, vice president for instruction, dean of academic affairs, or dean of instruction. Regardless of the title used, the questionnaire was mailed to the person holding the office coded as number 5 in the Directory.

In the case where an institution identified a number 5 category position but the position was vacant, the person was simply referred to as chief instructional officer (CIO). In the case where an institution did not identify a number 5 category position, the researcher contacted the president of the college, first by e-mail and then by phone if the e-mail message did not yield a response, and asked for the name and title of the person holding the highest academic office at the college.

Instrumentation

There was no known survey instrument to assess the perceptions of chief instructional officers at NCA-accredited community colleges toward the perceptions measured in this study. Consequently, a questionnaire was developed with reference to the literature on the following topics: (a) the survey research method and questionnaire design; (b) the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools' (NCA) accreditation process as carried out by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE)—particularly the literature on the Commission's Criteria for Accreditation and General Institutional Requirements (GIRs); and, (c) issues related to employing part-time faculty.

Questionnaire Design and Description

The following suggestions for designing a self-administered questionnaire, developing survey items, and administering a mail questionnaire posed by Babbie (1992, 1998), Carroll (1994), Dillman (1978), Foddy (1993), Fowler (1992), and Torabi (1991) were taken into account when constructing the survey instrument:

Construction

1. Select survey items that will yield the highest level of data possible (i.e., nominal,

ordinal, interval, or ratio level data).

2. Utilize both questions and statements.
3. Summarize brief statements and ask respondents whether they agree or disagree (e.g., use Likert Scale items).
4. Utilize closed-ended questions whenever possible. Closed-ended items provide greater uniformity and are more easily processed than open-ended questions. Open-ended questions must be coded before they can be processed for computer analysis.

Format

1. Spread-out questions and keep the survey uncluttered.
2. Use a single line per question.
3. Make questions fit each page.
4. Use the "items in a series" format. Individual questions for which responses are to be made by choosing among identical categories should be kept together in a section.
5. Use Boxes , brackets [ ], or parentheses ( ) technique for recording responses, or direct respondents to circle responses. Do not use open blanks.
6. Properly use and format contingency questions (i.e., questions that are asked and answered contingent on responses to preceding questions).
7. Isolate contingency questions, or connect them by using an arrow, and/or instruct the respondent to answer or skip dependent on whether or not the question applies to them.
8. Separate matrix questions from other questions (i.e., separate questions that yield Likert Scale responses).
9. Order questions by estimating their effect on data collection and the interpretation of

results.

10. Provide clear instructions and introductory comments where appropriate.

Survey Items

1. Design questions that are relevant to the purposes of the study.
2. Ask questions that identify exactly what kind of information is desired from the survey respondents.
3. Make items clear by operationalizing ambiguous words.
4. Avoid double-barreled questions.
5. Use response categories that indicate direction to measure perceptions.
6. Use words for answer choices.
7. Select respondents who are competent to answer survey items.
8. Avoid long items; short items are best.
9. Avoid negative terms.
10. Avoid biased items and terms.

The 36-item questionnaire included a brief paragraph describing the purpose of the study, ensuring respondents confidentiality, explaining consent, and stating a deadline for return. (See Appendix G for the complete survey.) It was printed in 10 inch font on 11" X 17" light manila paper and folded in half so that page one appeared on the front, page two and three on the inside, and page four on the back. It was divided into four sections, namely Data Form-Part I, II, III, and IV. Sections I through III used a four-point Likert-type scale to measure participants' perceptions regarding the issues addressed in the study. Section IV included three closed-ended informational questions. Each section was denoted by a subject heading, and included directions for responding to subsequent questions in the section.

Questionnaire items under Data Form-Part I, questions numbered 1 through 15, were designed to measure perceptions of participants regarding the amount of difficulty experienced in meeting the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education's (CIHE) Criteria for Accreditation and General Institutional Requirements (GIRs) for part-time faculty. The items in this section were constructed from the Commission's Criteria for Accreditation and related Patterns of Evidence and GIRs and related explications as stated in the 1997 NCA-CIHE Handbook of Accreditation (see Appendix D, Appendix E, and Appendix F). Respondents were asked to indicate, by circling the response that corresponded to their perception, the amount of difficulty experienced in meeting each of 15 accreditation criteria regarding part-time faculty.

Questionnaire items under Data Form-Part II, questions 16 through 25, were designed to measure perceptions of participants regarding the amount of challenge experienced in implementing practices for effectively employing part-time faculty. The items in this section were constructed from a thorough review of the literature on practices for effectively employing part-time faculty that were commonly identified as "challenging" for institutions to implement (see Chapter II). Respondents were asked to indicate, by circling the response that corresponded to their perception, the amount of challenge experienced in implementing each of 10 practices related to employing and utilizing part-time faculty.

Questionnaire items under Data Form-Part III, questions numbered 26 through 33, were designed to measure perceptions of participants regarding the amount of influence commonly cited reasons for employing part-time faculty have on the decision to employ part-time faculty. The items in this section were constructed from a thorough review of the literature on reasons for employing part-time faculty at community colleges (see Chapter II). Respondents were asked to indicate, by circling the response that corresponded to their perception, the amount of influence each of 7 reasons for employing part-time faculty had on the decision to employ part-time faculty. One item in this section, item number 33, was an open-ended question and afforded respondents the opportunity to identify reasons for employing part-time faculty that were not recognized under Data Form Part III.

Questionnaire items under Data Form-Part IV, questions numbered 34 through 36, were designed to collect data that may be used at a later date to address research questions, but were deemed to be beyond the scope of this study.

At the end of the questionnaire, respondents were afforded an opportunity to provide "additional comments and/or suggestions" in a qualitative format, as well as, request an executive summary of the study of the survey (indicated by responding "yes" or "no" to the question "Would you like an Executive Summary of the Survey Results?").

Issues of Validity and Reliability

The questionnaire was distributed to a panel of experts for review. (See Appendix H to view the cover letter sent to the Panel of Experts.) The panel commented on issues of face validity (the extent to which an empirical measure adequately reflects the real meaning of the perception under consideration) and content validity (the degree to which a measure covers the range of meanings included within the perception being measured). Panelists were selected based on their expertise in the areas of research methodology and survey design, community colleges, regional accreditation, North Central Association of

Colleges and Schools-Commission on Institutions of Higher Education's (NCA-CIHE) Criteria for Accreditation and General Institutional Requirements, and part-time faculty.

The panel was made-up of 22 representatives from the following areas, including:

1. Professors in the field of research methodology and survey design.
2. Professors in the field of higher education administration.
3. Researchers specializing in community colleges.
4. Researchers of part-time faculty at community colleges.
5. Senior level community college administrators, including chief instructional officers and presidents.
6. Chief instructional officers at community colleges accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) (these two representatives were excluded from the population under study).
7. Research analysts from the U.S. Department of Education and community college research centers, including the ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges, and the League for Innovation in Community Colleges.
8. Representatives from the Education Commission of the States.
9. Representatives from the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA).
10. NCA Consultant Evaluators.

Initially, the researcher planned to include a list of the names of panelists and their affiliate institution, organization, or association as an appendix to this study. Because the majority of panelists asked to remain anonymous, no such list was made available.

The issue of reliability was taken into consideration in the construction of the questionnaire. Reliability is whether a particular technique, applied repeatedly to the same object, yields the same result each time. According to Babbie (1992), "reliability does not ensure accuracy any more than precision ensures it" (p. 124). However, he notes a number of effective techniques for enhancing the reliability of a survey instrument including the following: (a) ask only about the things relevant to the respondents; (b) ask only about things the respondents are likely to know; and, (c) be clear in what you are asking. These techniques were taken into consideration when the investigator developed the questionnaire.

Data Collection Procedures

Each NCA-accredited community college represented by CIOs in this study was assigned a confidentiality code, numbers 1 through 340, a state code, numbers 1 through 19, and a community college classification code based on the Katsinas & Lacey (1996) Community College Classification System, numbers 1 through 11. This information was stored in a SPSS for Windows (version 9.0) data file.

The confidentiality code was marked on the questionnaire sent to each participant and on the mailing envelope that corresponded with the confidentiality code. By marking both the questionnaire and the mailing envelope, the researcher was able to double check that the questionnaire in the envelope accurately corresponded with the appropriate chief instructional officer at the institution identified on the address label on the mailing envelope. For example, the questionnaire that was coded number 32 was placed into the mailing enveloped marked number 32 that was addressed to the chief instructional officer at the institution assigned the confidentiality code number 32.

The mailing envelopes were addressed by name to the person identified as holding the highest academic office at the institution. The title "Chief Instructional Officer" (CIO) was listed under the name regardless of whether or not the person's title was CIO. In the case that the highest academic position at the institution was vacant, no name was identified and the first line on the mailing envelope read "Chief Instructional Officer." This method for addressing the mailing envelopes was used not only to enhance consistency and efficiency in printing mailing labels but to ensure that the questionnaire reached the appropriate office.

On February 26, 1999, survey materials were mailed in 6½" X 9½" manila clasped envelopes via bulk first-class U.S. Mail to chief instructional officers (CIOs) at 338 of the 340 community colleges accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA). Two of the 340 chief instructional officers in the survey population were not surveyed because each was a participant on the Panel of Experts who reviewed the instrument. The following items were included in this mailing: (a) the cover letter on business letterhead explaining the purpose and importance of the study, guaranteeing respondents confidentiality in reports of their responses, and noting that returning a completed questionnaire was accepted as consent to participate in the study (see Appendix I); (b) the survey instrument (see Appendix G), folded in three so it would fit neatly into the return envelope; and, (c) a 4" X 9" pre-stamped, self-addressed business-reply envelope.

Respondents were asked to return the questionnaire within three weeks. Neither the study participants' name nor affiliation of institution appeared on the return envelope. The only way to identify the chief instructional officer returning the questionnaire was by the confidentiality code marked on the back of the questionnaire. One hundred and sixtythree questionnaires were returned by the deadline for a response rate of 48%.

A "reminder postcard" (see Appendix J) was sent to the participants who did not return the questionnaire by the deadline asking them to disregard the postcard if they had already returned a questionnaire or to please return a completed questionnaire within two weeks in the case that they had not yet done so. The postcard listed the researcher's e-mail address in the case that a participant(s) who had not returned a questionnaire misplaced it and, subsequently, would need to request another copy and/or a return envelope. None of the remaining participants contacted the researcher to request survey materials. Twenty-seven new questionnaires were returned by the revised deadline. Upon completion of the survey period, a total of 190 questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 55%.

In an attempt to enhance the response rate, the researcher conducted a second mailing. The same procedures that were followed to conduct the first mailing were repeated for the second mailing. A new cover letter (see Appendix K) was written explaining the purpose and importance of the study. The cover letter to the questionnaire in the second mailing differed from the cover letter that accompanied the survey in the first mailing in that it offered a second opportunity to participate in the study. Participants were thanked in the case that they had already returned a questionnaire. Participants who had chosen not to participate were asked to reconsider and return a completed questionnaire. A questionnaire and a self-addressed, stamped business reply envelope were included among the mailed materials in the case that a participant(s) misplaced the materials sent in the first mailing. A new deadline for returning the questionnaire was provided. Upon completion of the second mailing, 220 questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 65%. No surveys were returned after this date.

Response Rate and Response Bias/Response Selectivity

The validity of a descriptive study that uses a mail survey can be threatened by a low response rate of returned surveys and response bias. In an effort to minimize the possibility of a low response rate, and, subsequently, strengthen the generalizability of the findings to the study population, the following suggestions offered by Dillman (1978), Torabi (1991), and Yammarino, Skinner, & Childers (1991) were taken into consideration, including the following: (a) offer an award for completing and returning the survey—The respondents were afforded an opportunity to request an executive summary of the study results; (b) limit the costs of participating in the study, including the amount of time it takes for respondents to complete the survey and the direct monetary costs of returning the survey—The questionnaire was designed to take a maximum of 10 minutes to complete and respondents were furnished with a self-addressed stamped business-reply envelope; and, (c) establish trust with respondents—The respondents were assured strict confidentiality.

The validity of the mail survey form of data collection can also be threatened by the effect of "response bias/response selectivity": The phenomena of a significant number of contacts ending in refusals. According to Dillman (1978), "each 10 percent increase in response rate decreases by 10 percentage points the range by which the distribution could be affected by refusals if the actual feelings of nonrespondents are extreme in either direction" (p. 52). In short, the higher the response rate, the less chance of significant response bias. In this study, the response rate of 65% lowered to 35% the range of possible effects refusals could have on the results.

In addressing the issue of response selectivity, it is important to know whether the characteristics of those who did not respond differ greatly from the characteristics of those who responded, even though extreme distributions, or even those in opposite directions, seldom occur (Dillman, 1978). In this study, the effect of response selectivity on the study results was explored by examining the characteristics of respondents and refusals and determining whether those characteristics differed for the information available, namely the names of the states in which the chief instructional officers' (CIOs) community colleges were located and the community colleges' classification category (i.e., their institutional type).

A second method was used to determine whether the responses of nonrespondents would have substantially changed the overall results of the study, namely "wave analysis." The wave analysis procedure for determining response bias "assumes that those who return surveys in the final weeks of the response period are 'almost' nonrespondents. If their responses are not different from those of other weeks, a strong case for absence of response bias can be established" (Cresswell, 1994, p. 123-124). A similar procedure was used in this study to address the issue of response bias. The researcher compared the responses on the questionnaires returned from the second wave of the mailing to responses on the questionnaires returned from the first wave of the mailing.

The results of the analysis of the data as it relates to the issue of response bias/response selectivity is presented in Chapter IV.

Data Analysis

The data were organized by community college type (as defined by the Katsinas & Lacey [1996] Community College Classification System) and analyzed using the following statistical treatments: (a) percentages; (b) frequencies; (c) means; (d) standard deviations; (e) one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test for significance; and (f) the Scheffe post hoc test for complex comparisons.

The data were entered into a SPSS (version 9.0) statistical software package for manipulation and analysis. In SPSS, there are no empty cells within a data file. If no value has been entered, the system supplies the "system-missing" value. SPSS excludes system-missing values from its calculations of means, standard deviations, other statistics and all reports. In the case of the study at hand, however, the user wished SPSS to treat, for a number of reasons, certain responses actually present in the data set as missing, but retain information about the relative frequencies of such responses. SPSS provides a function to treat "user missing" values. Like its treatment of system-missing values, SPSS excludes user-missing values from its calculation of means, standard deviations and other statistics. However, unlike its treatment of system missing values, SPSS includes user-missing values in all its data file reports.

In this study, the researcher coded a "no response" category. This category was not available to respondents as a response option, rather it was used solely for the purpose of describing the data. The no response category was coded number 99. SPSS treated the no response category as a user-missing value. In other words, non-responses were treated as missing, thereby excluded from the calculations of means, standard deviations and other statistics but were retained and reported in terms of their relative frequencies. The frequencies of "no responses" were reported, and reviewed for comparison purposes when appropriate.

The data were described in both the aggregate and by community college type in terms of percentages (P), frequencies (f), mean(s) (M), and standard deviation(s) (SD) as derived from each of 32 out of 36 questionnaire items, namely questionnaire items numbered 1 through 32 in 3 out of 4 questionnaire data parts (i.e., Data Form-Part I, Data Form-Part II, and Data Form-Part III).

Questionnaire item number 33 under Data Form-Part III and the last item on the questionnaire, which was not numbered, posed open-ended questions. The data for these items are described qualitatively rather than quantitatively in Chapter IV.

After the questionnaire was mailed, it was determined that items under Data Form-Part IV (i.e., questionnaire items numbered 34 through 36) would yield data for which analysis was beyond the scope of the study. Therefore, the responses to these items were neither analyzed nor reported.

Respondents were asked to select one of four responses for each questionnaire item under Data Forms-Part I through Part III. Upon receipt of the data, the researcher coded responses on a four-point Likert-type scale. The codes that were used to quantify the response categories are listed in Table 16.

Table 16

Likert-Type Scale Response Categories and Codes by Data Form-Parts I Through III

Data Form Part Directions	Response	Code
Data Form Part I		
Please indicate the amount of difficulty your institution(s) experiences in meeting each of the following NCA-accreditation criteria regarding part-time faculty.	not difficult	1
	slightly difficult	2
	moderately difficult	3
	very difficult	4

Data Form-Part II Please indicate the amount of challenge posed to your institution(s) by each of the following activities related to employing part-time faculty.	not a challenge	1
	a slight challenge	2
	a moderate challenge	3
	a strong challenge	4
Data Form-Part III Please indicate the amount of influence each of the following reasons has on your institution's(s') decision to employ part-time faculty.	not an influence	1
	a slight influence	2
	a moderate influence a strong	3
	influence	4

Due to the relatively small number of subjects in the study population, no advantage was found in surveying a random sample over the utilization of the population. Consequently, the researcher initially planned on using solely descriptive statistics to analyze the data. However, upon receipt of the questionnaire the researcher discovered that the respondent population was representative of the surveyed population on the factor, community college type. Therefore, the responding population was treated as a sample and inferential statistics were applied to analyze the data and make inferences about the larger population.

The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test for significance was used to test differences among group means (i.e., the means of community college type categories). In examining the relationships among community college type and perceptions, "between-group" differences were compared with the "within-group" differences (variance): how much each community college type differed from itself, for example. Both sets of comparisons were reconciled by ANOVA to calculate the likelihood that the observed differences were merely the result of sampling error at the .05 level of significance.

The Scheffe post hoc test for complex comparisons was used to determine whether significant F ratios at the .05 level of significance in ANOVA were due to differences between group means. Scheffe's method is appropriate to any contrast of means even when the sample sizes may be unequal (Bogartz, 1994), which was the case in this study. According to Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs (1994), the Scheffe method is the most versatile and at the same time the most conservative post hoc complex comparison procedure. They recommend using it to examine complex contrasts (e.g., several means against several other means) following the acceptance of statistical significance in the ANOVA. In this study, the Scheffe method was used to examine complex comparisons between several sample means. Bogartz (1994) highly recommends Scheffe's method for "data snooping where the investigator has not planned the contrasts in advance but is trying to find whatever might be lying in the bushes" (pp. 327-28). This study was exploratory in nature and there were limited expectations as to what the data would reveal because prior research on the topic was limited.

Summary

This study involved the mailing of 338 surveys to chief instructional officers (CIOs) of all community colleges accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA). Two hundred and twenty (220) surveys were returned for a response rate of 65%. The data were organized by community college type as defined by Katsinas & Laceys' (1996) Community College Classification System, which categorizes institutions based on type of control (public, private, and federally chartered/special use), location (public rural, suburban, and urban), and size (rural small, medium, and large).

Data from 217 useable questionnaires were analyzed. Statistical treatments used to analyze the data included percentages, frequencies, means, standard deviations, the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test for significance, and the Scheffe post hoc test for complex comparisons. The research results, organized by research questions, are presented in Chapter IV.

Chapter IV

Analysis of the Data

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to identify, describe, and compare the perceptions of chief instructional officers (CIOs) at two-year colleges accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) regarding the following issues related to the employment of part-time faculty: (a) the amount of difficulty experienced in meeting regional accreditation criteria for part-time faculty; (b) the amount of challenge experienced in implementing effective practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty; and, (c) the amount of influence commonly cited reasons for employing part-time faculty have on the decision to employ part-time faculty.

The data were organized by community college type using the Katsinas & Lacey (1996) Community College Classification System, which categorizes community colleges based on three factors: type of control (public, private, and federally chartered/special use), location (public rural, suburban, and urban), and size (rural small, medium, and large).

This chapter provides evidence to answer the research questions through the presentation of the data using text and tables. It is organized into the following sections: (a) population, sample, and response rate; (b) data analysis and findings; and, (c) chapter summary.

Population, Sample, and Response Rate

The population for this study included CIOs at all 340 two-year colleges accredited by the NCA. Surveys were mailed to 338 of the 340 CIOs identified within the chosen population. Two CIOs were excluded from the survey population because each was a member on the panel of experts that reviewed the survey instrument. Two hundred and twenty (220) questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 65%: Three (3) were incomplete. Ultimately, the data from 217 questionnaires were analyzed to answer the research questions.

In an effort to address the possibility of response bias/response selectivity, differences between respondents and refusals on the two known characteristics of the population, community college type and state, were analyzed. The analysis of the response rate for CIOs from each of the 11 community college type subgroups revealed an acceptable rate of return. No significant differences were found in the survey response rates between respondents and refusals in terms of community college type. Specifically, the proportion of community colleges by type within the respondent population was identical to the proportion of community colleges by type within the surveyed population, giving the appearance of a representative stratified sample (see Table 17).

Table 17

Percentage Differences Between Population and Sample by Katsinas & Lacey (1996) Community College Type Category

	Number of NCA-Accredited Community Colleges			Percentage of NCA-Accredited Community Colleges		
Community College Type	Population	Sample	Response Rate	Population	Sample	Difference
Public						
Rural, Small	20	12	60%	5.9	5.5	-0.4
Rural, Medium	90	59	66%	26.6	27.2	+0.6
Rural, Large	95	60	63%	28.1	27.6	-0.1
Total	205	131	64%	60.7	60.4	-0.3
Suburban, Single Campus	39	25	64%	11.5	11.5	0.0
Suburban, Multi-Campus	9	6	67%	2.7	2.8	+0.1
Total	48	31	67%	14.2	14.3	+0.1
Urban, Single Campus	15	11	73%	4.4	5.1	+0.7
Urban, Multi-Campus	26	14	54%	7.7	6.5	-1.2
Total	41	25	61%	12.1	11.5	-0.6
Total	294	187	64%	86.9	86.2	-0.7
Private						
Non-Profit	17	13	76%	5.0	6.0	+0.1
Proprietary	9	5	56%	2.7	2.3	-0.4
Total	26	18	69%	7.7	8.3	-1.4
Total	26	18	69%	7.7	8.3	-1.4
Federally Chartered & Special Use						
Tribal	13	10	77%	3.8	4.6	+0.8
Special Use	5	2	40%	1.5	.9	-0.6
Total	18	12	67%	5.3	5.5	+0.2
Total	18	12	67%	5.3	5.5	+0.2
Grand Total	338	217	64%	100	100	n/a

Note: 338 CIOs were surveyed. 220 questionnaires were returned. Data from 217 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

CIOs from public community colleges represented over 86% of the population and the sample.

Additionally, the issue of response selectivity was examined through an analysis of the data by state. The Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) is responsible for conducting the accreditation process in 19 states, which accounted for 2,908,801 (or 32%) of the 9,229,052 students enrolled in community colleges nationally in 1998. The study population included CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges in all 19 of these states. There were small differences between the percentage of community colleges by state in the population and in the sample (see Table 18). Because the state in which the chief instructional officers' community colleges were located was not a variable under consideration for this study, any differences between the surveyed and respondent populations in terms of state were deemed to be unimportant

In an effort to further examine the issue of "response bias," "wave analysis" was employed to determine whether response selectivity substantially changed the overall results of the survey. The wave analysis procedure for determining response bias "assumes that those who return surveys in the final weeks of the response period are 'almost' nonrespondents. If their responses are not different from those of other weeks, a strong case for absence of response bias can be established" (Cresswell, 1994, pp. 123-124).

Following a similar procedure, the responses on surveys returned from

Table 18

Percentage Differences Between Population and Sample by State

	Number of NCA-Accredited Community Colleges			Percentage of NCA-Accredited Community Colleges		
State	Population	Sample	Response Rate	Population	Sample	Difference
Arizona	21	12	57%	6.2	5.5	-0.7
Arkansas	19	10	53%	5.6	4.6	-1.0
Colorado	15	6	40%	4.4	2.8	-2.3
Illinois	53	35	66%	15.7	16.1	+0.4
Indiana	5	3	60%	1.5	1.4	-0.1
Iowa	18	9	50%	5.3	4.1	-1.2
Kansas	23	15	65%	6.8	6.9	+0.1
Michigan	31	22	71%	9.2	10.1	+0.9
Minnesota	27	16	59%	8.0	7.4	-0.6

Missouri	17	11	65%	5.0	5.1	+0.1
Nebraska	7	3	43%	2.1	1.4	-0.7
New Mexico	12	9	75%	3.6	4.1	+0.5
North Dakota	10	8	80%	3.0	3.7	+0.7
Ohio	29	22	76%	8.6	10.1	+1.5
Oklahoma	16	11	69%	4.7	5.1	+0.4
South Dakota	6	4	67%	1.8	1.8	0.0
West Virginia	4	2	50%	1.2	0.9	-0.3
Wisconsin	18	13	72%	5.3	6.0	+0.7
Wyoming	7	6	86%	2.1	2.8	+0.7
Total	338	217	64%	100	100	n/a

Note: 338 CIOs were surveyed. 220 questionnaires were returned. Data from 217 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

the first mailing, or the "first wave", were compared to responses on surveys returned from the second mailing, or the "second wave." The responses were analyzed to determine whether differences existed among CIOs based on community college type. There were no differences overall or by community college type between the survey responses returned from the first and second mailings. That is, there were no significant differences between the responses of the non-respondent CIOs and those who responded to the survey (see Table 19). This finding presents a strong case for the absence of response bias, or, at the least, supports the conclusion that response bias had a minimal effect on the overall results of the survey. Additionally, this finding suggests that the results of the survey can be generalized to all colleges in the population (i.e., all NCA-accredited community colleges).

Table 19

Percentage Differences Between First and Second Waves of Mailings

Survey Questionnaire Item	Mean of First Mailing (First Wave)	Mean of Second Mailing (Second Wave)	Percentage Difference

1	2.21	2.37	.16
2	2.30	2.44	.14
3	2.39	2.54	.15
4	1.87	2.02	.15
5	2.85	2.94	.36
6	2.57	2.53	.04
7	1.82	1.88	.06
8	1.94	1.98	.04
9	2.02	2.05	.03
10	2.17	2.21	.04
11	1.84	1.84	.00
12	2.01	2.11	.10
13	2.87	2.61	.26
14	2.66	2.44	.22
15	2.55	2.39	.16
16	2.69	2.65	.04
17	3.15	3.25	.10
18	2.33	2.33	.00
19	2.56	2.58	.02
20	2.59	2.54	.05
21	2.41	2.39	.02
22	3.17	3.16	.01
23	3.02	3.11	.09
24	3.03	2.98	.05
25	2.39	2.32	.07
26	3.21	3.21	.00
27	3.20	3.33	.13
28	3.16	3.33	.13
29	3.21	3.32	.11
30	1.95	2.00	.05
31	2.94	3.07	.13
32	2.87	3.04	.17

Note: 163 questionnaires were returned in the first mailing; 57 in the second mailing. Data from 217 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Data Analysis and Findings

This section presents the results of the research and subsequent findings. It is divided into two parts. The quantitative data for survey items numbered 1 through 32 are presented in the first part. The data are described using percentages (P), frequencies (f), means (M), and standard deviations (SD). The findings related to the research questions are presented in narrative form, accompanied by tables. The qualitative data from questionnaire item number 33 under Data Form Part III, which provided respondents an opportunity to identify reasons for employing part-time faculty that were not acknowledged under Data Form Part III, are reported in the second part of this section. The last section of the survey, which was not numbered, provided respondents an opportunity to make suggestions and/or comments. That data is presented in an appendix.

The research questions were addressed through the analysis of the mean scores of perceptions and standard deviations for each of 32 questionnaire items. Responses were analyzed by applying a Likert-type scale. A score of 1 on the scale was deemed the least affirming perception and a score of 4 the most affirming. Because 2.50 is the central number between 1 and 4, it was used as the determinant between non-affirming and affirming responses, with mean scores smaller than 2.50 indicating a nonaffirmative perception and means scores of 2.50 and larger indicating an affirmative perception.

Standard deviations were used to identify the extent to which individual scores were clustered around the mean or spread out away from it. The standard deviations indicated how far to go above and below the mean to include approximately two-thirds of all cases. For example, a mean score of 2.44 with a standard deviation of .99 would indicate that two-thirds of respondents had a score between 1.45 and 3.43: (2.44-.99) and (2.44+.99), respectively. The means and standard deviations for questionnaire items under Data Form Parts I, II, and III are presented in the aggregate. The means and standard deviations by community college type for each survey item under Form Parts I, II, and III are provided in Appendixes L, M, and N.

Because the respondent population was representative of the surveyed population, it was treated as a sample. Inferential statistics were used to make inferences about the larger population. The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test for significance and the Scheffe post hoc test for complex comparisons were applied to analyze significant differences in the data by community college type at the .05 alpha level.

The ANOVA compares the amount of heterogeneity between samples with the amount within samples. It is based on the following reasoning:

> If subjects are exposed to the same conditions as others in their own group, but to conditions that differ from those which subjects in the other groups are exposed (and those conditions make a difference), then subjects within groups will be more alike than subjects between groups (Loether & McTavish , 1980, p. 543).

As applied in this study, the ANOVA was used to compare differences among the responses of CIOs between and within the levels of the factor community college type (i.e., between and within type of control, location, and size levels). In the cases where differences between levels tested significant ($p<.05$) but differences within levels did not, it was concluded that the perceptions of CIOs between the levels of the factor community college type were significantly different from one another, while the perceptions of CIOs within the levels of the factor community college type were not. As presented in the ANOVA tables in this chapter, in every case where significant differences ($p<.05$) were found to exist among the CIOs' responses the differences existed between levels, not within levels. In the cases of significant F ratios in the ANOVA, the Scheffe test was used to determine the source of significant differences between subgroup means.

Quantitative Data

Research Question 1: Do CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges perceive meeting CIHE accreditation criteria for part-time faculty as difficult?

Data Form Part I (questionnaire items 1 through 15) measured the perceptions of CIOs regarding the amount of difficulty experienced in meeting the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) Criteria for Accreditation and General Institutional Requirements (GIRs) for part-time faculty. As presented in Table 20, overall CIOs perceived meeting CIHE accreditation criteria as less than difficult ($M<2.50$). On a scale of 1 to 4, with 1 being not difficult and 4 being very difficult, the mean response for items under Data Form Part I was 2.27. The standard deviation (SD) of the mean of responses for questions 1 through 15 was .99, meaning two thirds of respondents had a score between 1.28 and 3.26: (2.27-.99) and (2.27 +.99), respectively.

Table 20

Means and Standard Deviations, Data Form Part I (Questionnaire Items 1 Through 15)

Data Form Part I: Please indicate the amount of difficulty your institution(s) experience in meeting each of the following NCA-accreditation criteria regarding part-time faculty. (Circle one response for each item.)

		Mean	Standard Deviation
		2.27	.99
Average Number of Responses	211		
Missing Responses	6		
Total Number in Population	217		

Note. Data from 217 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Response Categories
1= not difficult
2= slightly difficult
3= moderately difficult
4= very difficult

Although the mean of responses for Data Form Part I indicated that CIOs on average perceived meeting CIHE accreditation criteria for part-time faculty as less than difficult (M<2.50), the means for 5 out of the 15 questionnaire items under Data Form Part I (i.e., questionnaire items 5, 6, 13, 14, and 15) were larger than 2.50. As presented in Table 21, CIOs perceived meeting the following criteria as difficult (M>2.50): (a) upgrading the academic credentials of part-time faculty who hold less than baccalaureate degrees (M=2.83); (b) ensuring that part-time faculty who hold less than baccalaureate degrees are actively pursuing courses of study that

Table 21

Means of 2.50 and Larger and Standard Deviations for Data Form Part I (Questionnaire Items 1 through 15)

Data Form Part I: Please indicate the amount of difficulty your institution(s) experiences in meeting each of the following NCA-accreditation criteria regarding part-time faculty. (Circle one response for each item.)

Questionnaire Item	Number in Sample	Mean	Standard Deviation
5. Upgrading the academic credentials of part-time faculty who hold less than baccalaureate degrees, whether or not they possess special training, experience, creative production, or other accomplishments or distinctions that qualify them for their specific assignments is...	191*	2.83	1.06
6. Ensuring that part-time faculty who do not hold the typical degrees expected in an institution offering the level of instruction are nearing completion of these degrees, or, are with instructional encouragement and support, actively pursuing courses of study that will lead to these degrees within three to five years is...	198**	2.61	1.10
13. Including part-time faculty in institutional governance is...	213	2.84	1.04
14. Including part-time faculty in developing the institution's educational program is...	215	2.68	.98
15. Including part-time faculty in evaluating the institution's educational programs is...	214	2.54	.96

Note. Data from 217 useable questionnaires were analyzed. Response Categories: 1= not difficult 3= moderately difficult
2= slightly difficult 4= very difficult

CIOs in the aggregate perceived meeting these five NCA accreditation criteria for part-time faculty as difficult (M>2.50).

* 24 of the 26 nonrespondents reported that this question was not applicable because their institution does not hire part-time faculty who hold less than a baccalaureate degree.
** 17 of the 19 nonrespondents reported that this question was not applicable because their institution does not hire part-time faculty who hold less than a baccalaureate degree.

will lead to the completion of these degrees (M=2.61); and, (c) including part-time faculty in institutional governance (M=2.84) and in developing (M=2.68) and evaluating (M=2.54) the institution's educational programs.

As previously discussed, the mean of responses for Data Form Part I indicated that CIOs on average perceived meeting CIHE accreditation criteria for part-time faculty as less than difficult (M<2.50), however the standard deviation (.99) indicated a large amount of variability of scores around the mean (1.28 to 3.26). An examination of subgroup means revealed that CIOs at some types of two-year colleges perceived meeting accreditation criteria for part-time faculty as more difficult than CIOs at other types of two-year colleges. For example, CIOs at public rural small and special use two-year colleges perceived meeting individual accreditation criteria as difficult (M>2.50) more frequently than other subgroups.

CIOs at public rural small community colleges perceived ensuring that part-time faculty teaching transfer courses hold graduate degrees (M=3.08), and ensuring that part-time faculty teaching general education courses hold graduate degrees that include substantial study appropriate to the academic field in which they teach (M=3.17) as particularly difficult.

CIOs at special use community colleges perceived meeting nearly all criteria for part-time faculty as difficult. They achieved a mean score of 2.56 for the 15 questions regarding the amount of difficulty experienced in meeting CIHE accreditation criteria. They perceived adopting and implementing criteria for hiring and replacing part-time faculty who do not hold appropriate degrees (M=3.50 and M=3.00, respectively), employing a sufficient number of full-time faculty (M=3.00), and employing at least one full-time faculty member for as many majors as their institution offers (M=3.00) as particularly difficult. The means and standard deviations by community college type for each questionnaire item under Data Form Part I are presented in Appendix L.

Research Question 1a: Are there significant differences in the perceptions of difficulty in meeting CIHE accreditation criteria for part-time faculty among CIOs at public, private, and federally chartered/special use NCA-accredited community colleges?

The one-way ANOVA test for significance was applied to determine if there were significant differences ($p<.05$) in the perceptions of CIOs regarding difficulty in meeting accreditation criteria for part-time faculty among the type of control levels of the factor community college type, namely the public, private, and federally chartered/special use levels. The ANOVA revealed significant differences ($p<.05$) between the levels on 3 out of the 15 questionnaire items under Data Form Part I. There were no significant differences within the levels (see Table 22).

In the cases where overall F ratios in the ANOVA were significant ($p<.05$), the Scheffe post hoc test for complex comparisons was used to identify the source of significant differences between the subgroup means. Scheffe's test revealed significant differences ($p<.05$) between the public and private subgroup means on 3 out of the 3, and between the federally

Table 22

Summary of Analysis of Variance by Type of Control (Public, Private, and Federally Chartered/Special Use): Data Form Part I

(Questionnaire Items 1 Through 15)

Data Form Part I: Please indicate the amount of difficulty your institution(s) experiences in meeting the following NCA accreditation criteria regarding part-time faculty. (Circle one response for each item.)

Questionnaire Item	Source of Variance			SS		df	MS	F	Sig.
1. Employing part-time faculty that have earned from accredited institutions the degrees appropriate to the level of instruction offered by your institution is…	Between Groups	6.408	2	3.204		3.934*	.021		
	Within Groups		173.476	213	.814				
	Total		179.884	215					
2. Ensuring that all or nearly all part-time faculty teaching transfer courses hold graduate degrees is…	Between Groups	9.546	2	4.773		4.328*	.014		
	Within Groups		235.984	214	1.103				
	Total			245.530	216				
3. Ensuring part-time faculty teaching general education courses hold graduate degrees that includes substantial study (typically a minimum of 18 semester hours at the graduate level) appropriate to the academic field in which they teach is…	Between Groups	12.045	2	6.023		5.445*	.005		
	Within Groups		236.720	214	1.106				
	Total		248.765	216					

Note. Data from 217 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Response Categories:
1= not difficult
2= slightly difficult
3= moderately difficult
4= very difficult

Key to calculations:

Source of Variance = between groups (b), within groups (w)
SS = sum of squares (square each deviation score and sum the squared deviations across all subjects in all groups)
df = degrees of freedom (number of rows in the calculation minus one times the number of columns in the calculation minus one)
MS = mean squared (estimate of variance of population: MS = SS/df)
F = F ratio (differences among variances as tested by using the F distribution as the sampling distribution: F = MSb/MSw)

* The F ratio was significant at the .05 alpha level.

chartered/special use and private subgroup means on 1 out of the 3, questionnaire items that tested significant ($p<.05$) in the ANOVA.

As presented in Table 23, Scheffe's test revealed: (a) CIOs at public community colleges (M=2.27) perceived employing part-time faculty who hold degrees appropriate to the level of instruction offered by their institution as more difficult than CIOs at private community colleges (M=1.67); (b) CIOs at public community colleges (M=2.35) perceived ensuring that all or nearly all part-time faculty teaching transfer courses hold graduate degrees as more difficult than CIOs at private community colleges (M=1.61); (c) CIOs at public community colleges (M=2.43) perceived ensuring that part-time faculty teaching general education courses hold graduate degrees that include substantial study appropriate to the academic field in which they teach as more difficult than CIOs at private community colleges (M=1.61); and, (d) CIOs at federally chartered/special use community colleges (M=2.67) perceived ensuring that part-time faculty teaching general education courses hold graduate degrees that include substantial study appropriate to the academic field in which they teach as more difficult than CIOs at private community colleges (M=1.61).

Research Question 1b: Are there significant differences in the perceptions of difficulty in meeting CIHE accreditation criteria for part-time faculty among CIOs at rural, suburban, and urban public NCA-accredited community colleges?

The one-way ANOVA test for significance was applied to determine if

Table 23

Summary of Scheffe Post Hoc Test for Complex Comparisons by Type of Control (Public, Private, and Federally Chartered/Special Use): Data Form Part I (Questionnaire Items 1 Through 15)

Questionnaire Item	Source of Difference (Mean)	(Mean)		Difference Between Means	Sig.
1. Employing part-time faculty that have earned from accredited institutions the degrees appropriate to the level of instruction offered by your institution is…	public (2.27)	private (1.67)	.60*	.028	
2. Ensuring that all or nearly all part-time faculty teaching transfer courses hold graduate degrees is…	public (2.35)	private (1.61)	.74*	.018	
3. Ensuring part-time faculty teaching general education courses hold graduate degrees that includes substantial study (typically a minimum of 18 semester at the graduate level) appropriate to the academic field in which they teach is…	public (2.43)	private (1.61)	.82*	.008	
	federally chartered/ special use (2.67)	private (1.61)	1.06*	.028	

Note. Data from 217 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Response Categories:
1= not difficult
2= slightly difficult
3= moderately difficult
4= very difficult

CIOs at public community colleges perceived it as more difficult than CIOs at private community colleges to meet these three NCA accreditation criteria for part-time faculty. CIOs at federally chartered/special use community colleges perceived it as more difficult than CIOs at private community colleges to meet one out of these three NCA accreditation criteria for part-time faculty.

* The mean difference was significant at the .05 alpha level.

there were significant differences (p<.05) in the perceptions of CIOs regarding difficulty in meeting accreditation criteria for part-time faculty among the location levels of the factor community college type, namely the public rural, suburban, and urban levels. The ANOVA revealed significant differences (p<.05) between the levels on 7 out of the 15 questionnaire items under Data Form Part I. There were no significant differences within the levels (see Table 24).

In the cases where overall F ratios in the ANOVA were significant (p<.05), the Scheffe post hoc test for complex comparisons was used to identify the source of significant differences between subgroup means.

Scheffe's test revealed significant differences (p<.05) between the rural and suburban subgroup means on 4 out of the 7, and between rural and urban subgroup means on 6 out of the 7, questionnaire items that tested significant (p<.05) in the ANOVA.

As presented in Table 25, Scheffe's test revealed: (a) CIOs at public rural community colleges (M=2.50) perceived employing part-time faculty who hold degrees appropriate to the instruction offered by their institution as more difficult than CIOs at public suburban (M=1.75) and public urban (M=1.72) community colleges; (b) CIOs at public rural community colleges (M=2.69) perceived ensuring that all or nearly all part-time faculty teaching transfer courses hold graduate degrees as more difficult than CIOs at public suburban (M=1.71) and public urban (M=1.40) community colleges; (c) CIOs at public rural community colleges (M=2.75) perceived ensuring that

Table 24

Summary of Analysis of Variance by Location (Public Rural, Suburban, and Urban): Data Form Part I (Questionnaire Items 1 Through 15)

Data Form Part I: Please indicate the amount of difficulty your institution(s) experiences in meeting the following NCA accreditation criteria regarding part-time faculty. (Circle one response for each item.)

Questionnaire Item	Source of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
1. Employing part-time faculty that have earned from accredited institutions the degrees appropriate to the to the level of instruction offered by your institution is...	Between Groups	23.084	2	11.542	16.569*	.000
	Within Groups	127.475	183	.697		
	Total	150.559	185			
2. Ensuring that all or nearly all part-time faculty teaching transfer courses hold graduate degrees is...	Between Groups	50.151	2	25.075	28.383*	.000
	Within Groups	162.555	184	.883		
	Total	212.706	186			
3. Ensuring part-time faculty teaching general education courses hold graduate degrees that includes substantial study (typically a minimum of 18 semester hours at the graduate level) appropriate to the academic field in which they teach is...	Between Groups	45.153	2	22.576	25.862*	.000
	Within Groups	160.623	184	.873		
	Total	205.775	186			
4. Ensuring that part-time faculty who hold less than baccalaureate degrees possess special training, experience, creative production or other accomplishments or distinctions that qualify them for their specific assignment is...	Between Groups	6.404	2	3.202	4.154*	.000
	Within Groups	135.641	176	.771		
	Total	142.045	178			

6. Ensuring that part-time faculty who do not hold the the typical degrees expected in an institution offering the level of instruction are nearing completion of these degrees, or, are with instructional encouragement and support, actively pursuing courses of study that will lead to these degrees within three to five years is...	Between Groups	7.655	2	3.828	3.213*	.043
	Within Groups	202.541	170	1.191		
	Total	210.197	172			
7. Adopting criteria and processes for hiring and replacing part-time faculty that require possession of the degree typical for the level of instruction offered by your institution is...	Between Groups	13.127	2	6.564	8.340*	.000
	Within Groups	144.018	183	.787		
	Total	157.145	185			
8. Implementing criteria and processes for hiring and replacing part-time faculty that require possession of the degree typical for the level of instruction offered by your institution is...	Between Groups	13.419	2	6.709	8.294*	.000
	Within Groups	148.043	183			
	Total					

Note. Data from 217 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Response Categories:	1= not difficult	3= moderately difficult
	2= slightly difficult	4= very difficult

Key to calculations:

Source of Variance = between groups (b), within groups (w)

SS = sum of squares (square each deviation score and sum the squared deviations across all subjects in all groups)

df = degrees of freedom (number of rows in the calculation minus one times the number of columns in the calculation minus one)

MS = mean squared (estimate of variance of population: MS = SS/df)

F = F ratio (differences among variances as tested by using the F distribution as the sampling distribution: F = MSb/MSw)

* The F ratio was significant at the .05 alpha level.

Table 25

Summary of Scheffe Post Hoc Test for Complex Comparisons by Location (Public Rural, Suburban, and Urban): Data Form Part I

(Questionnaire Items 1 Through 15)

Questionnaire Item	Source of Difference (Mean)	(Mean)	Difference Between Means	Sig.
1. Employing part-time faculty that have earned from accredited institutions the degrees appropriate to the level of instruction offered by your institution is...	rural (2.50)	suburban (1.75)	.76*	.000
		urban (1.72)	.78*	.000
2. Ensuring that all or nearly all part-time faculty teaching general education courses hold graduate degrees is...	rural (2.69)	suburban (1.71)	.98*	.000
		urban (1.40)	1.29*	.000
3. Ensuring part-time faculty teaching general education courses hold graduate degrees that includes substantial study (typically a minimum of 18 semester at the graduate level) appropriate to the academic field in which they teach is...	rural (2.75)	suburban (1.74)	1.01*	.000
		urban (1.60)	1.15*	.000
4. Ensuring that part-time faculty who hold less than baccalaureate degrees possess special training, experience, creative production or other accomplishments or distinctions that qualify them for their specific assignment is...	rural (1.98)	urban (1.46)	.53*	.029

6. Ensuring that part-time faculty who do not hold the typical degrees expected in an institution offering the level of instruction are nearing completion of these degrees, or, are with instructional encouragement and support, actively pursuing courses of study that will lead to these degrees within three to five years is...	rural	urban (2.71)	(2.20)	.80*	.000
7. Adopting criteria and processes for hiring and replacing part-time faculty that require possession of the degree typical for the level of instruction offered by your institution is...	rural (1.98)	suburban (1.25)		.73*	.001
8. Implementing criteria and processes for hiring and replacing part-time faculty that require possession of the degree typical for the level of instruction offered by your institution is...	rural (2.12)	urban (1.40)		.72*	.002

Note. Data from 217 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Response Categories:
1= not difficult 3= moderately difficult
2= slightly difficult 4= very difficult

CIOs at public rural community colleges perceived it as more difficult than CIOs at public suburban community colleges to meet four out of these seven NCA accreditation criteria for part-time faculty. CIOs at public rural community colleges perceived it as more difficult than CIOs at public urban community colleges to meet six out of these seven NCA accreditation criteria for part-time faculty.

* The mean difference was significant at the .05 alpha level.

part-time faculty teaching general education courses hold graduate degrees appropriate to the academic field in which they teach as more difficult than CIOs at public suburban (M=1.74) and public urban (M=1.60) community colleges; (d) CIOs at public rural community colleges (M=1.98) perceived ensuring that part-time faculty who hold less than baccalaureate degrees possess special training, experience, creative production or other accomplishments or distinctions that qualify them for their specific assignments as more difficult than CIOs at public urban community colleges (M=1.46); (e) CIOs at public rural community colleges (M=2.71) perceived ensuring that part-time faculty who do not hold the typical degrees expected in an institution offering the level of instruction are nearing the completion of these degrees or are actively pursuing courses of study that will lead to these degrees within three to five years as more difficult than CIOs at public urban community colleges (M=2.20); (f) CIOs at public rural community colleges (M=1.98) perceived adopting criteria and processes for hiring and replacing part-time faculty that require possession of the degree typical for the level of instruction offered by their institution as more difficult than CIOs at public urban community colleges (M=1.25); and, (g) CIOs at public rural community colleges (M=2.12) perceived implementing criteria and processes for hiring and replacing part-time faculty that require possession of the degree typical for the level of instruction offered by their institution as more difficult than CIOs at public urban community colleges (M=1.40).

Research Question 1c: Are there significant differences in the perceptions of difficulty in meeting CIHE accreditation criteria for part-time faculty among CIOs at small, medium, and large rural NCA-accredited community colleges?

The one-way ANOVA test for significance was applied to determine if there were significant differences ($p<.05$) in the perceptions of CIOs regarding difficulty in meeting CIHE accreditation criteria for part-time faculty among the size levels of the factor community college type, namely the rural small, medium, and large levels. The ANOVA revealed no significant differences ($p<.05$) among the levels on all questionnaire items under Data Form Part I. Based on the results of the ANOVA, it was not necessary to employ the Scheffe test for complex comparisons.

Research Question 2: Do CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges perceive implementing commonly cited practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty as challenging?

Data Form Part II (questionnaire items 16 through 25) measured the perceptions of CIOs regarding the amount of challenge experienced in implementing commonly cited practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty. As presented in Table 26, overall CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges perceived implementing commonly cited practices for employing part-time faculty as challenging ($M>2.50$). On a scale of 1 to 4, with 1 being not a challenge and 4 being a strong challenge, the mean response for questionnaire items under Data Form Part II was 2.73. The standard deviation (*SD*) was .88, meaning two thirds of respondents had a score between 1.85 and 3.61: (2.73-.88) and (2.73+.88), respectively.

Table 26

Means and Standard Deviations, Data Form Part II (Questionnaire Items 16 Through 25)

Data Form Part II: Please indicate the amount of challenge posed to your institution by each of the following activities related to employing part-time faculty. (Circle one response for each item.)

		Mean	Standard Deviation
		2.73	.88
Average Number or Responses	216		
Missing Responses	1		
Total Number in Population	217		

Note: Data from 217 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Response Categories

1= not a challenge	3= a moderate challenge
2= a slight challenge	4= a strong challenge

As presented in Table 27, the means for 7 out of the 10 questionnaire items under Data Form Part II (i.e., questionnaire items 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, and 24) were larger than 2.50. CIOs perceived implementing practices for recruiting (M=2.66), orienting (M=2.57), and supervising (M=2.60) part-time faculty as challenging. CIOs perceived implementing practices for finding part-time faculty well-versed in technology based teaching and learning (M=3.17), involving part-time faculty in campus life (M=3.19), monitoring the extent to which part-time faculty maintain current in their discipline (M=2.98), and providing professional development for part-time faculty (M=3.02) as particularly challenging. The only practices that CIOs on the

Table 27

Means of 2.50 and Larger and Standard Deviations for Data Form Part II (Questionnaire Items 16 Through 25)

Data Form Part II: Please indicate the amount of challenge posed to your institution(s) by each of the following activities related to employing part-time faculty. (Circle one response for each item.)

Questionnaire Item	Number in Sample	Mean	Standard Deviation
16. Recruiting part-time faculty is...	216	2.66	.80
17. Finding part-time faculty well versed in technology based teaching and learning is...	216	3.17	.82
19. Orienting part-time faculty is...	217	2.57	.89
20. Supervising part-time faculty...	217	2.60	.93
22. Involving part-time faculty in campus life is...	217	3.19	.93
23. Providing faculty development for part-time faculty is...	215	3.02	.90
24. Monitoring the extent to which part-time faculty maintain current in their discipline is...	217	2.98	.87

Note. Data from 217 useable questionnaires were analyzed. Response Categories: 1= not a challenge 3= a moderate challenge 2= a slight challenge 4= a strong challenge

CIOs in the aggregate perceived implementing these seven practices for employing part-time faculty as challenging (*M* > 2.50).

average *did not* consider challenging to implement were those related to selecting/hiring (M=2.32), evaluating (M=2.44), and retaining (M=2.36) part-time faculty.

As previously stated, the standard deviation of the mean of responses for questions 16 through 25 was .88. This score indicated a large amount of variability of scores around the mean (1.85 to 3.61). An examination of subgroup means revealed that CIOs at some types of community colleges perceived implementing practices for employing part-time faculty as more challenging than CIOs at other types of community colleges. For example, CIOs at rural community colleges perceived implementing the practices deemed by CIOs at other types of community colleges as not challenging, namely selecting/hiring, evaluating and retaining part-time faculty, as equally challenging as the other practices. They achieved mean scores of 2.53, 2.51, and 2.50, respectively, on those items. The means and standard deviations by community college type for each questionnaire item under Data Form Part II are presented in Appendix M.

Research Question 2a: Are there significant differences in the perceptions of challenge in implementing commonly cited practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty among CIOs at public, private, and federally chartered/special use NCA-accredited community colleges?

The one-way ANOVA test for significance was applied to determine if there were significant differences (p<.05) in the perceptions of CIOs regarding challenge in implementing commonly cited practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty among the type of control levels of the factor community college type, namely the public, private, and federally chartered/special use levels. The ANOVA revealed significant differences (p<.05) *between* the levels on 2 out of the 10 questionnaire items under Data

Form Part II. There were no significant differences within the levels (see Table 28).

In the cases where overall F ratios in the ANOVA were significant ($p<.05$), the Scheffe post hoc test for complex comparisons was used to identify the source of significant differences between subgroup means. Scheffe's test revealed significant differences ($p<.05$) between public and private subgroup means on 1 out of the 2, and between public and federally chartered/special use subgroup means on 1 out of the 2, questionnaire items that tested significant ($p<.05$) in the ANOVA.

As presented in Table 29, Scheffe's test revealed: (a) CIOs at public community colleges ($M=2.73$) perceived recruiting part-time faculty as more challenging than CIOs at private community colleges ($M=2.00$), and (b) CIOs at public community colleges ($M=3.27$) perceived involving part-time faculty in campus life as more challenging than CIOs at federally chartered/special use community colleges ($M=2.58$).

Research Question 2b: Are there significant differences in the perceptions of challenge in implementing commonly cited practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty among CIOs at rural, suburban, and urban public NCA-accredited community colleges?

Table 28

Summary of Analysis of Variance by Type of Control (Public, Private, and Federally Chartered/Special Use: Data Form Part II

(Questionnaire Items 16 Through 25)

Data Form Part II: Please indicate the amount of challenge posed to your institution(s) by each of the following activities related to employing part-time faculty. (Circle one response for each item.)

Questionnaire Item	Source of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
16. Recruiting part-time faculty is...	Between Groups	8.646	2	4.323	7.212*	.001
	Within Groups	127.683	213	.599		
	Total	136.329	215			
22. Involving part-time faculty in campus life is...	Between Groups	8.752	2	4.376	5.228*	.006
	Within Groups	179.119	214	.837		
	Total	187.871	216			

Note. Data from 217 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Response Categories:
1= not a challenge
2= a slight challenge
3= a moderate challenge
4= a strong challenge

Key to calculations:

Source of Variance = between groups (b), within groups (w)
SS = sum of squares (square each deviation score and sum the squared deviations across all subjects in all groups)
df = degrees of freedom (number of rows in the calculation minus one times the number of columns in the calculation minus one)
MS = mean squared (estimate of variance of population: MS = SS/df)
F = F ratio (differences among variances as tested by using the F distribution as the sampling distribution: F = MSb/MSw)

* The F ratio was significant at the .05 alpha level.

Table 29

Summary of Scheffe Post Hoc Test for Complex Comparisons by Type of Control (Public, Private, and Federally Chartered/Special Use): Data Form Part II (Questionnaire Items 16 Through 25)

Questionnaire Item	Source of Difference (Mean)	 (Mean)	Difference Between Means	Sig.
16. Recruiting part-time faculty is...	public (2.73)	private (2.00)	.73*	.001
22. Involving part-time faculty in campus life is...	public (3.27)	federally chartered/ special use (2.58)	.69*	.043

Note. Data from 217 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Response Categories:
1= not a challenge 3= a moderate challenge
2= a slight challenge 4= a strong challenge

CIOs at public community colleges perceived it as more challenging than CIOs at private community colleges to implement one of these two practices for employing part-time faculty. CIOs at public community colleges perceived it as more challenging than CIOs at federally chartered/special use community colleges to implement one out of these two practices for employing part-time faculty .

* The mean difference was significant at the .05 alpha level.

The one-way ANOVA test for significance was applied to determine if there were significant differences ($p<.05$) in the perceptions of CIOs regarding challenge in implementing commonly cited practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty among the location levels of the factor community college type, namely the public rural, suburban, and urban levels. The ANOVA revealed significant differences ($p<.05$) *between* the levels on 4 out of the 10 questionnaire items under Data Form Part II. There were no significant differences *within* the levels (see Table 30).

In the cases where overall F ratios in the ANOVA were significant ($p<.05$), the Scheffe post hoc test for complex comparisons was used to identify the source of significant differences between subgroup means. Scheffe's test revealed significant differences ($p<.05$) between rural and suburban subgroup means on 3 out of the 4, and between rural and urban subgroup means on 3 out of the 4, questionnaire items that tested significant in the ANOVA.

As presented in Table 31, Scheffe's test revealed the following: (a) CIOs at public rural community colleges ($M=2.88$) perceived recruiting part-time faculty as *more challenging* than CIOs at public suburban ($M=2.39$) and public urban ($M=2.36$) community colleges; (b) CIOs at public rural community colleges ($M=3.29$) perceived finding part-time faculty well-versed in technology-based teaching and learning as *more challenging* than CIOs at public urban community colleges ($M=2.75$); (c) CIOs at public rural community colleges ($M=3.29$) perceived selecting/hiring part-time faculty

Table 30

Summary of Analysis of Variance by Location (Public Rural, Suburban, and Urban): Data Form Part II (Questionnaire Items 16 Through 25)

Data Form Part II: Please indicate the amount of challenge posed to your institution(s) by each of the following activities related to employing part-time faculty. (Circle one response for each item.)

Questionnaire Item	Source of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
16. Recruiting part-time faculty is....	Between Groups	9.871	2	4.935	9.109*	.000
	Within Groups	99.146	183	.542		
	Total	109.016	185			
17. Finding part-time faculty well versed in technology based teaching and learning is...	Between Groups	6.700	2	3.350	5.090*	.007
	Within Groups	120.445	183	.658		
	Total	127.145	185			
18. Selecting/hiring part-time faculty is...	Between Groups	12.447	2	6.223	11.080*	.000
	Within Groups	130.350	184	.562		
	Total	115.797	186			
19. Orienting part-time faculty is...	Between Groups	4.983	2	2.492	3.423*	.000
	Within Groups	133.936	184	.728		
	Total	138.920	186			

Note. Data from 217 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Response Categories: 1= not a challenge 3= a moderate challenge 2= a slight challenge 4= a strong challenge

Key to calculations:

Source of Variance = between groups (b), within groups (w)

SS = sum of squares (square each deviation score and sum the squared deviations across all subjects in all groups)

df = degrees of freedom (number of rows in the calculation minus one times the number of columns in the calculation minus one)

MS = mean squared (estimate of variance of population: MS = SS/df)

F = F ratio (differences among variances as tested by using the F distribution as the sampling distribution: F = MSb/MSw)

* The F ratio was significant at the .05 alpha level.

Table 31

Summary of Scheffe Post Hoc Test for Complex Comparisons by Location (Public Rural, Suburban, Urban): Data Form Part II

(Questionnaire Items 16 Through 25)

Questionnaire Item	Source of Difference (Mean)	(Mean)	Difference Between Means	Sig.
16. Recruiting part-time faculty is…	rural (2.88)	suburban (2.30)	.49*	.005
		urban (2.36)	.52*	.007
17. Finding part-time faculty well versed in technology based teaching and learning is…	rural (3.29)	urban (2.75)	.54*	.012
18. Selecting/hiring part-time faculty is…	rural (2.54)	suburban (1.94)	.61*	.000
		urban (2.04)	.50*	.010
19. Orienting part-time faculty is…	rural (2.70)	suburban (2.29)	.50*	.010

Note. Data from 217 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Response Categories: 1= not a challenge 3= a moderate challenge 2= a slight challenge 4= a strong challenge

CIOs at public rural community colleges perceived it as more challenging than CIOs at public suburban community colleges to implement three out of these four practices for employing part-time faculty. CIOs at public rural community colleges perceived it as more challenging than CIOs at public urban community colleges to implement three out of these four practices for employing part-time faculty.

* The mean difference was significant at the .05 alpha level.

as more challenging than CIOs at public suburban (M=1.94) and public urban community colleges (M=2.04); and, (d) CIOs at public rural community colleges (M=2.70) perceived orienting part-time faculty as more challenging than CIOs at public suburban community colleges (M=2.29).

Research Question 2c: Are there significant differences in the perceptions of challenge in implementing commonly cited practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty among CIOs at small, medium, and large rural NCA-accredited community colleges?

The one-way ANOVA test for significance was applied to determine if there were significant differences (p<.05) in the perceptions of CIOs regarding challenge in implementing commonly cited practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty among the size levels of the factor community college type, namely the rural small, medium, and large levels. The ANOVA revealed no significant differences (p<.05) among the levels on all questionnaire items under Data Form Part II. Based on the results of the ANOVA, it was not necessary to employ the Scheffe test for complex comparisons.

Research Question 3: Do CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges perceive commonly cited reasons for employing part-time faculty as influential on the decision to employ part-time faculty?

Data Form Part III (questionnaire items 26 through 32) measured the perceptions of CIOs regarding the amount of influence commonly cited reasons for employing part-time faculty have on the decision to employ part-time faculty. Overall, CIOs perceived commonly cited reasons for employing part-time faculty as influential on the decision to employ part-time faculty (M>2.50). On a scale of 1 to 4, with 1 being not an influence and 4 being a strong influence, the mean score for questionnaire items under Data Form Part III was 2.96. The standard deviation (SD) was .87, meaning that two thirds of the respondents had a score between 2.09 and 3.83: (2.96-.87) and (2.96+.87), respectively (see Table 32).

Table 32

Means and Standard Deviations, Data Form Part III (Questionnaire Items 26 Through 32)

Data Form Part III: Please indicate the amount of influence each of the following reasons has on your institution(s) decision to employ part-time faculty. (Circle one response for each item.)

		Mean	Standard Deviation
		2.96	.87
Average Number of Responses	217		
Missing Responses	0		
Total Number in Population	217		

Note. Data from 217 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Response Categories
1= not an influence
2= a slight influence
3= a moderate influence
4= a strong influence

As presented in Table 33, the means for 6 out of 7 questionnaire items under Data Form Part III (i.e., questionnaire items 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, and 32) were not only larger than 2.50, but larger than 3.00. CIOs employ part-time

Table 33

Means of 2.50 and Larger and Standard Deviations for Data Form Part III (Questionnaire Items 26 through 32)

Data Form Part II: Please indicate the amount of influence each of the following reasons for employing part-time faculty has on you institution's decision to employ part-time faculty. (Circle one response for each item.)

Questionnaire Item	Number in Sample	Mean	Standard Deviation
26. Affording institutional flexibility to match fluctuating enrollments is...	217	3.22	.83
27. Bringing professional experience to the classroom is...	217	3.18	.87
28. Bringing current experience to the classroom is...	217	3.15	.88
29. Bringing practical experience to the classroom is...	217	3.23	.83
31. Saving on costs of faculty salaries is...	216	3.00	.92
32. Saving on costs of faculty benefits (e.g., health insurance) is...	217	2.93	.97

Note. Data from 217 useable questionnaires were analyzed. Response Categories: 1= not an influence 3= a moderate influence 2= a slight influence 4= a strong influence

CIOs in the aggregate perceived these six reasons for employing part-time faculty as influential on the decision to employ part-time faculty (*M* > 2.50).

faculty because doing so affords institutional flexibility to match staffing to fluctuating enrollments (*M*=3.22), brings professional (*M*=3.18), current (*M*=3.15), and practical (*M*=3.23) experience into the classroom, and saves on costs of faculty salaries (M=3.00) and benefits (*M*=2.93). Conversely, CIOs *did not* perceive the employment of part-time faculty as a means to provide teaching experience to those who are seeking full-time faculty positions (*M*=1.98).

As previously stated, the standard deviation of the mean of responses for questions 26 through 32 was .87, indicating some amount of variability of scores around the mean (2.09 to 3.83). An examination of the subgroup means revealed that CIOs at some types of community colleges perceived some, but very few, reasons for employing part-time faculty as more influential on the decision to employ part-time faculty than CIOs at other types of community colleges. For example, CIOs at special use community colleges perceived the following reasons for employing part-time faculty as being very influential (*M*=4.00) on the decision to employ part-time faculty: Affording institutional flexibility to match fluctuating enrollments, bringing current experience into the classroom, and bringing practical experience into the classroom. The means and standard deviations by community college type for each question under Data Form Part III are presented in Appendix N.

Research Question 3a: Are there significant differences in the perceptions of influential reasons for employing part-time faculty among CIOs at public, private, and federally chartered/special use NCA-accredited community colleges?

The one-way ANOVA test for significance was applied to determine if there were significant differences (p<.05) in the perceptions of CIOs regarding influential reasons for employing part-time faculty among the type of control levels of the factor community college type, namely the public, private, and federally chartered/special use levels. The ANOVA revealed no significant differences (p<.05) among the levels on all questionnaire items under Data Form Part III. Based on the results of the ANOVA, it was not necessary to employ the Scheffe test for complex comparisons.

Research Question 3b: Are there significant differences in the perceptions of influential reasons for employing part-time faculty among CIOs at rural, suburban, and urban public NCA-accredited community colleges?

The one-way ANOVA test for significance was applied to determine if there were significant differences (p<.05) in the perceptions of CIOs regarding influential reasons for employing part-time faculty among the location levels of the factor community college type, namely the public rural, suburban, and urban levels. The ANOVA revealed no significant differences (p<.05) among the levels on questionnaire items under Data Form Part III. Based on the results of the ANOVA, it was not necessary to employ the Scheffe test for complex comparisons.

Research Question 3c: Are there significant differences in the perceptions of influential reasons for employing part-time faculty among CIOs at small, medium, and large rural NCA-accredited community colleges?

The one-way ANOVA test for significance was applied to determine if there were significant differences (p<.05) in the perceptions of CIOs regarding influential reasons for employing part-time faculty among the size levels of the factor community college type, namely the rural small, medium, and large levels. The ANOVA revealed significant differences ($p<.05$) between the levels on 1 of 7 questionnaire items under Data Form Part III. There were no significant differences within the levels (see Table 34).

In the cases where overall F ratios in the ANOVA were significant ($p<.05$), the Scheffe post hoc test for complex comparisons was used to identify the source of significant differences between subgroup means. Scheffe's test revealed significant differences ($p<.05$) between the small and large subgroup means on 1 out of the 1 questionnaire items that tested significant ($p<.05$) in the ANOVA.

As presented in Table 35, there was a small, but significant, difference in the perceptions regarding influential reasons for employing part-time faculty among CIOs at rural community colleges by size. CIOs at large rural community colleges ($M=3.20$) perceived saving costs of faculty benefits as more influential on the decision to employ part-time faculty than CIOs at small rural community colleges ($M=2.42$).

Table 34

Summary of Analysis of Variance by Size (Rural Small, Medium, and Large): Data Form Part III (Questionnaire Items 26 Through 32)

Data Form Part II: Please indicate the amount of influence each of the following reasons for employing part-time faculty has on your institution's decision to employ part-time faculty. (Circle one response for each item.)

Questionnaire Item	Source of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
32. Saving on costs of faculty benefits (e.g., health insurance) is...	Between Groups	7.734	2	3.867	4.846*	.009
	Within Groups	102.104	128	.798		
	Total	109.878	130			

Note. Data from 217 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Response Categories:
1= not an influence 3= a moderate influence
2= a slight influence 4= a strong influence

Key to calculations:
Source of Variance = between groups (b), within groups (w)
SS = sum of squares (square each deviation score and sum the squared deviations across all subjects in all groups)
df = degrees of freedom (number of rows in the calculation minus one times the number of columns in the calculation minus one)
MS = mean squared (estimate of variance of population: MS = SS/df)
F = F ratio (differences among variances as tested by using the F distribution as the sampling distribution: F = MSb/MSw)

* The F ratio was significant at the .05 alpha level.

Table 35

Summary of Scheffe Post Hoc Test for Complex Comparisons by Size (Rural Small, Medium, and Large): Data Form Part III (Questionnaire Items 26 Through 32)

Questionnaire Item	Source of Difference (Mean)	(Mean)	Difference Between Means	Sig.
32. Saving on costs of faculty benefits (e.g., health insurance) is...	small (2.42)	large (3.20)	.78*	.024

Note. Data from 217 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Response Categories: 1= not an influence 3= a moderate influence
2= a slight influence 4= a strong influence

CIOs at small rural community colleges perceived this reason for employing part-time faculty as more influential on the decision to employ part-time faculty than CIOs at large rural community colleges.

* The mean difference was significant at the .05 alpha level.

Qualitative Data

Questionnaire item 33 provided respondents an opportunity to identify reasons for employing part-time faculty that were not recognized under Data Form Part III, and to indicate the level of influence the reason(s) has on the decision to employ part-time faculty. As presented below, the respondents' responses and their community college type are underlined and in parenthesis, respectively.

Unavailability of Full-Time Faculty

1. Cannot find full-time faculty- a slight influence (Public Rural Medium)
2. Urban or rural location- a strong influence (Public Suburban Single Campus)
3. Demographics of district are very influential: high availability of educated citizenry in our district- a strong influence (Public Suburban Multi-Campus)

4. Hiring faculty for multiple sections of a course offered at the same time- a strong influence (Public Rural Medium)
5. Inability to attract full-time faculty (Public Rural Small)

Scheduling Flexibility

6. Affording a variety of courses in a very small institution- a strong influence (Private Nonprofit)
7. Test viability of new course offering without committing full-time faculty- a strong influence (Public Suburban Single Campus)
8. Teaching a 0-5 FTE [i.e., 0 to 5 full-time students] when a full-time load is not needed in a specific discipline- strong influence (Public Suburban Single)
9. Increases in student enrollment- moderate influence (Public Suburban Single)
10. Scheduling flexibility- strong influence (Private Nonprofit)

Expertise

11. Limited availability of full-time faculty expertise in Science, Behavioral Sciences, and Math- a moderate influence (Public Rural Medium)
12. Broaden knowledge/skills within a department to foster change- a strong influence (Public Suburban Single)
13. Meeting local corporate training needs- a strong influence (Public Urban Multi-Campus)

Potential for Full-Time Faculty

14. Part-time teaching is the best possible interview for full-time positions- a strong influence (Public Suburban Single)

Money

15. Operating budget constraints- a strong influence (Public Suburban Single Campus)
16. Lack of funding for full-time faculty- a strong influence (Public Rural Large)
17. Inability to afford full-time faculty in some disciplines- a slight influence (Public Rural Small)

Linkages with the Community

18. Promoting community participation - a strong influence (Public Rural Large)
19. Providing a connection to local high schools- a moderate influence (Public Rural Large)

Required by State Mandate or Professional Accrediting Body

20. Requirement to maintain a 50% PT-FT faculty teaching ratio across the institution- a strong influence (Public Suburban Multi-Campus)
21. Maintaining state mandated certification- a strong influence (Public Rural Medium)

Other

22. Nontraditional delivery of class offerings- a strong influence (Public Rural Large)

The 22 responses to this item were sorted into categories based on common themes, recurring ideas or language, and patterns of belief that linked the statements together. In summary, respondents added the following reasons for employing part-time faculty:

1. Part-time faculty are employed because a sufficient number of full-time faculty are not available in their area [i.e., the geographic area in which their community college is located, which is generally assigned by the state].
2. The practice [of employing part-time faculty] affords institutions the ability to offer

and test the viability of a variety of courses.

3. Part-timers provide expertise in areas outside of full-timers' expertise.
4. Employing part-time faculty puts fewer financial constraints on institutional operating budgets than employing full-time faculty.
5. Employing part-time faculty provides linkages with the local community
6. The state and professional accrediting bodies mandate that part-time faculty who are expert in certain areas deliver instruction.
7. Employing part-time faculty often functions as an "informal" interview prior to the hiring process for full-time positions.

An indepth analysis of the qualitative data revealed that the differences in the CIOs qualitative responses were similar to the differences in their quantitative responses, which were discussed above. CIOs from rural community colleges added more reasons for employing part-time faculty than CIOs from any other type of community college. Specifically, CIOs from rural community colleges voiced that they employ part-time faculty because finding full-time faculty is difficult, it allows their institution to offer multiple sections of a course at the same time, their institution is unable to attract full-time faculty, there is a limited availability of full-time faculty in the academic areas of science, behavioral sciences, and math, and their institution lacks the necessary funding to employ full-time faculty. Additionally, CIOs at rural community colleges noted that employing part-time faculty promotes community participation and provides a connection to local high schools, enhances their institution's ability to maintain state mandated certification, and allows for the delivery of nontraditional class offerings.

The final section of the questionnaire, which was not numbered, provided respondents an opportunity to make suggestions and/or comments about the study and the questionnaire. This data is presented in Appendix O.

Summary

This chapter presented the evidence to answer the research questions and subsequent findings. It was divided into three sections. A strong case for the absence of response bias/response selectivity was made in the first section. An analysis of the differences between respondents and non-respondents revealed that response bias/response selectivity had little to no effect on the overall results of the survey, suggesting that the findings of the study can be generalized to the population (i.e., to all NCA-accredited two-year colleges).

The data analysis section was divided into two parts. The analysis of quantitative data for survey items numbered 1 through 32 was presented in the first part of that section. The data were described using frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations. The findings related to the research questions were presented in narrative form, accompanied by tables. Each research question was addressed through the analysis of the mean scores of perceptions for each of 32 questionnaire items. Responses were analyzed by applying a four-point Likert-type scale. A score of 1 on the scale was deemed the least affirming perception and a score of 4 the most affirming perception. Mean scores smaller than 2.50 were considered nonaffirming responses and mean scores of 2.50 and larger were considered affirming responses.

Because the respondent population was representative of the surveyed population, it was treated as a sample. The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test for significance and the Scheffe post hoc test for complex comparisons were applied to analyze significant differences ($p<.05$) in the data by community college type.

Qualitative data from questionnaire item 33 was reported, but not analyzed, in the second part of the data analysis section. Question number 33 offered respondents the opportunity to identify additional reasons for employing part-time faculty not identified elsewhere on the questionnaire.

A discussion of the findings, conclusions of the study, and recommendations for further research are presented in Chapter V.

Chapter V

Discussion of the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Introduction

Issues related to the employment and utilization of part-time faculty at two-year colleges have been at the center of discussions within academe since their inception into the American system of higher education at the turn of the 20th century. The percentage of faculty teaching part-time at community colleges significantly and steadily grew between the late 1960s and the mid-1990s, increasing from 34% to 65%. During this period, discussions about the employment of part-time faculty for the delivery of instruction typically focused on the problems associated with the practice. By the mid-1990s, it was apparent that the percentage of part-time faculty teaching at community colleges would not decrease in the near future. Subsequently, discussions on the topic shifted from merely criticizing the use of part-time faculty to identifying effective part-time faculty employment practices.

The change in focus was partly the result of the activities of regional accrediting bodies. By 1990, most of the country's higher education institutional accreditors developed measures of quality faculty and effective teaching, which were incorporated into their overall evaluations of colleges and universities. Additionally, accreditors sanctioned assessment and/or institutional effectiveness policies with similar basic features, including criteria against which faculty are judged as part of the accreditation process. Today, all six—the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges—have published statements on institutional standards and policies regarding faculty, both full- and part-time.

The North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) is the regional accreditor that was the focus of this investigation. Its Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) conducts the NCA postsecondary accreditation process. The Commission established Criteria for Accreditation in 1981 and General Institutional Requirements (GIRs) in 1987 to define the essential characteristics expected of all NCA-affiliated institutions. In 1992, CIHE revised its Criteria for Accreditation and GIRs, including those related to faculty, both full- and part-time. Although member institutions participated in the revision process, until now there have been no attempts to examine the implementation of these standards from the eyes of administrators at NCA-accredited community colleges. Specifically, there were no data available to either verify or negate the amount of difficulty experienced by administrators at the 340 NCA-accredited two-year colleges in meeting accreditation criteria for part-time faculty prior to this investigation.

This study provided an opportunity for chief instructional officers (CIOs) at two-year colleges accredited by the NCA to comment on the difficulty experienced in meeting the NCA Commission on Institutions of Higher Education Criteria (CIHE) for Accreditation and GIRs for part-time faculty. It also afforded CIOs the opportunity to provide information about the challenge experienced in implementing effective practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty, and to comment on the influence of commonly cited reasons for employing part-time faculty on the decision to employ part-time faculty.

A questionnaire was developed by the researcher and mailed to the chief instructional officers (CIOs) of all two-year colleges accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA). Two hundred and twenty (220) surveys were returned, resulting in a 65% response rate. The data from 217 useable surveys were organized by institutional type using the Katsinas & Lacey (1996) Community College Classification System. This scheme was used to categorize two-year colleges into 11 institutional types based on three major type of control categories: public, private, and federally chartered/special use. Institutions were further subcategorized within the public grouping based on their state assigned geographic location: rural, suburban, and urban. Within the rural grouping, public two-year colleges were subcategorized by size: small (Full-time equivalent students
[FTE]<1,000), medium (FTE=1,000 to 2,499), and large (FTE>2,500).

Statistical treatments used to analyze the data included percentages (P), frequencies (f), means (M), standard deviations (SD), the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test for significance, and the Scheffe post hoc test for complex comparisons. It is hoped that the findings of the study will be used to improve the practices related to employing and utilizing part-time faculty, rather than to fuel the debates about their place at two-year colleges, their status as characterized by numbers and percentages, and the quality of their instruction in comparison to full-time faculty.

This chapter includes the following sections: (a) discussion of the findings; (b) conclusions; (c) recommendations for further research; and, (d) closing remarks.

Discussion of the Findings

The results of this study provided evidence to answer the research questions. Because the respondent population was representative of the surveyed population, it was treated as a sample. An analysis of differences between respondents and non-respondents revealed that response bias/response selectivity had little to no effect on the overall results of the survey, which suggests that the findings of the study can be generalized to all colleges in the population (i.e., all NCA-accredited two-year colleges). The focus of this chapter now turns to a discussion of the findings of the study.

1. Overall, chief instructional officers (CIOs) at NCA-accredited community colleges perceive meeting CIHE accreditation criteria for part-time faculty as not difficult. However, CIOs perceive meeting some criteria as difficult.

On a Likert-type scale of 1 to 4, with a score less than 2.50 considered a non-affirmative response and a score of 2.50 or higher considered an affirmative response, the mean score for questionnaire items under Data Form Part I, which addressed the amount of difficult experienced in meeting CIHE accreditation criteria, was 2.27. However, the CIOs perceived meeting criteria related to upgrading the academic credentials of part-time faculty who hold less than baccalaureate degrees, regardless of whether or not they possess special training, experience, creative production, or other accomplishments or distinctions that qualify them for their specific assignments, as difficult (M=2.83).

Additionally, they perceived including part-time faculty in institutional governance (M=2.84) and in developing (M=2.68) and evaluating (M=2.54) their institution's educational programs as difficult.

Although the CIOs perceived meeting criteria for upgrading the academic credentials of part-time faculty who hold less than baccalaureate degrees as difficult, they perceived meeting criteria related to ensuring part-time faculty teaching transfer courses (M= 2.30) or general education courses (M=2.37) hold master's degrees as not difficult. The apparent contradiction in this finding may be explained by the diverse nature of the curriculum offered at two-year colleges in the population under study, which included comprehensive community colleges and technical colleges. Whereas the former type of two-year colleges offers both transfer and vocational programs, the later typically offers vocational/professional programs only. In the case of hiring part-time faculty, evidence of experience in a particular vocational/ professional field is often used to substitute minimum qualifications such as possession of a baccalaureate degree. One CIO stated it was "Difficult to answer many of these [questions related to meeting accreditation criteria]: "General education part-time faculty are in a far different category than technology faculty. The survey may have been more informative if it broke-out the two groups." Another CIO commented, "These questions were difficult in that faculty who teach general education transfer courses typically, with minor exceptions, hold master's degrees. The governing board allows faculty who hold no degree to teach in vocational programs, where there are no accreditation standards, as long as they are experts in the field. For those faculty there is no pressure for a degree." Still another CIO noted, "Employing qualified part-time faculty is very difficult for the technology areas." A comment made by one CIO sums up the apparent contraction in this finding: "These answers are for general education faculty. The responses could be quite different for some technical areas. (See Appendix O for a list of the CIOs' suggestions and/or comments by Data Form Part I). The finding that the CIOs perceived upgrading the academic credentials of part-time faculty who hold less than a baccalaureate degree as difficult may have been influenced by the fact that 26 of the CIOs did not respond to that questionnaire item. Twenty-four (24) of the 26 non-respondents indicated the question was not applicable because their institution does not hire part-time faculty who hold less than a baccalaureate degree. If these CIOs would have responded to this question, the results may have been different.

The finding that the CIOs perceive upgrading the academic credentials of part-time faculty who hold less than a baccalaureate degree as difficult implies that the faculty were hired without the degree. This finding may simply be the result of limited access to part-time faculty who hold a bachelor's degree or higher. As presented in Table 36, 13 of the 19 states in the population under study are among the 26 states in the country with the lowest proportion (under 20%) of adults holding a bachelor's degree or higher. That is, 50% of the states with the lowest proportion of adults holding a four-year degree or higher are located within the North Central region.

The Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) applies the same accreditation criteria to all faculty regardless of status (i.e., regardless of full-time faculty or part-time faculty status). Likewise, most institutional practices and policies delineate the same required minimum academic credentials for full- and part-time faculty (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). It would be interesting to examine whether the results of the survey would be the same if full-time faculty, rather than part-time faculty, were the topic of the study: Would CIOs perceive upgrading the academic credentials of full-time faculty who hold less than a baccalaureate degree as difficult? This is an important point considering critics of utilizing part-time faculty

Table 36

Proportion of Adults with a Bachelor's or Higher Degree, by State, 1990

State	Percentage of Adults with a Bachelor's Degree or Higher	State	Percentage of Adults with a Bachelor's Degree or Higher
Alabama	16%	Montana	20%
Alaska	23%	Nebraska *	19%
Arizona *	20%	Nevada	15%
Arkansas *	13%	New Hampshire	24%
California	23%	New Jersey	25%
Colorado *	27%	New Mexico *	20%
Connecticut	27%	New York	23%
Delaware	21%	North Carolina	17%
Florida	18%	North Dakota *	18%
Georgia	19%	Ohio *	17%
Hawaii	23%	Oklahoma *	18%
Idaho	18%	Oregon	21%
Illinois *	21%	Pennsylvania	18%
Indiana *	16%	Rhode Island	21%
Iowa *	17%	South Carolina	17%
Kansas *	21%	South Dakota *	17%
Kentucky	14%	Tennessee	16%
Louisiana	16%	Texas	20%
Maine	19%	Utah	22%
Maryland	33%	Vermont	24%
Massachusetts	27%	Virginia	25%
Michigan *	17%	Washington	23%
Minnesota *	22%	West Virginia *	12%
Mississippi	15%	Wisconsin *	22%
Missouri *	18%	Wyoming *	19%

Source: 1999-2000 Almanac. (2000). The Chronicle of Higher Education. [On-line]. Available: http//chronicle.com/weekly/almanac/2000/maps/bachelor.htm

* State within the NCA region

commonly contend they are less "qualified" than full-time faculty (Ashford, 1993; Ashworth, 1988; Astin, 1975, 1993; Clark, 1988, 1993; Commission on the Future of

Community Colleges, 1988; Fedler, 1989; Friedlander, 1979; Goldberg, 1990; Kemp, 1994; Law, 1987; Mojock, 1990; Samuel, 1989; Selvadurai, 1990; Spangler, 1990; Thompson, 1992; Williams, 1995; Wright, 1995). The possession of minimum academic credentials could be considered a measure of "qualified." If it was found that ensuring and/or upgrading the academic credentials of both full- and part-time faculty who hold less than baccalaureate degrees is difficult, the debate about the "quality" of part-time faculty in comparison to full-time faculty may incorporate a whole new dimension.

2. There are significant differences in the perceptions of difficulty in meeting CIHE accreditation criteria for part-time faculty among CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges based on the type of control and geographic location of their institutions. The CIOs at public community colleges perceived meeting accreditation criteria related to employing part-time faculty with appropriate degrees, ensuring that part-time faculty teaching transfer courses hold graduate degrees, and ensuring that part-time faculty teaching general education courses hold graduate degrees that include substantial study appropriate to the academic field in which they teach as more difficult than the CIOs at private community colleges.

This finding may simply be the result of numbers. There are fewer private (non-profit and for-profit) two-year colleges than public two-year colleges in the United States, 684 and 1,092, respectively. Additionally, there are substantially fewer two-year college students enrolled in privates than publics, 248,864 and 5,314,463, respectively ("1999-2000 Almanac Issue," 1999). In general, private colleges and universities utilize fewer part-time faculty than public colleges and universities; this is the case for private two-year colleges (National Center for Education Statistics, 1998). The majority of respondents who indicated that their institution does not employ part-time faculty who hold less than a baccalaureate degree were from private two-year colleges. Consequently, CIOs at private two-year colleges may find it less difficult than their counterparts at public institutions to ensure part-time faculty hold appropriate credentials.

The CIOs at public rural community colleges overwhelmingly perceived meeting accreditation criteria for part-time as more difficult than their counterparts at public urban and public suburban two-year colleges. They perceived meeting criteria related to ensuring part-time faculty teaching transfer courses hold graduate degrees (M=2.69) and those teaching general education courses hold graduate degrees that include substantial study (a minimum of 18 semester hours) appropriate to the academic field in which they teach (M=2.75), and ensuring that part-time faculty who do not hold the typical degrees expected in an institution offering the level of instruction are actively pursuing courses of study that will lead to these degrees within three to five years (M=2.71) as particularly difficult.

This finding was not surprising. It is well documented in the literature and research on community colleges that institutions operating in urban and suburban areas have fewer reasons to be concerned with adequate numbers, academic credentials, or specialized training and experiences in part-time faculty pools (Eller, Martinez, Pace, Pavel, Garza, & Barnett, 1998; Katsinas & Miller, 1998; Killacky & Valadez, 1995; Milam, 1995; Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1995; Scheibmeir, 1980). One CIO commented that his/her urban institution had "the benefit of a large number of qualified individuals [part-time faculty]." On the other hand, several of the CIOs commented on the unique challenges faced by rural institutions in trying to ensure that part-time faculty hold minimum qualifications: "Our more rural sites have qualification difficulties. A bachelor of arts degree and 18 graduate credit hours in subject area [sic] is difficult to find from high school teachers;" "We are a small rural college providing services to a large number of small communities (average community population of 1000-3000 people). It is very difficult to find part-time faculty with the required academic credentials." (See Appendix O for a list of the CIOs' suggestions and/or comments by Data Form Part I).

3. Overall, CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges perceive implementing commonly cited practices for effectively employing and utilizing part-time faculty as challenging.

On a Likert-type scale of 1 to 4, with a score less than 2.50 considered a non-affirmative response and a score of 2.50 or higher considered an affirmative response, the mean score for questionnaire items under Data Form Part II, which addressed the amount of challenge experienced in implementing commonly cited practices for effectively employing and utilizing part-time faculty, was 2.73. The CIOs perceived recruiting (M=2.66), orienting (M=2.57), supervising (M=2.60) and involving part-time faculty in campus life (M=3.19), finding part-time faculty well versed in technology based teaching and learning (M=3.17), monitoring the extent to which part-time faculty maintain current in their discipline (M=2.98), and providing professional development for part-time faculty (M=3.02) as particularly challenging to implement.

The community college literature has documented trends in the employment and utilization of part-time faculty at community colleges. Researchers overwhelming conclude that implementing effective strategies for recruiting, selecting/hiring, orienting, involving, and evaluating part-time faculty, and providing staff development for part-time faculty results in the employment of qualified part-time instructors and increased rates of retention among those instructors. (Allysen, 1996; Biles & Tuckman, 1986; Burnstad & Wheeler, 1996; Digranes & Digranes, 1995; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1995). (See Table 2 in Chapter II for a summary of the findings of the literature and research on practices for effectively employing and utilizing part-time faculty).

Interesting to note is that the practices commonly identified as important for effectively employing and utilizing part-time faculty are the same practices that the CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges perceived as challenging to implement. Additionally, the CIOs indicated that it is particularly difficult to find part-time faculty well versed in technology-based teaching and learning. This finding is important to consider given the expanding use of technology in teaching and learning (Vaughn, 2000).

4. There are significant differences in the perceptions of challenges in implementing commonly cited practices for effectively employing and utilizing part-time faculty among CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges based on the type of control and geographical location of their institutions.

The CIOs at public community colleges perceived implementing practices for recruiting and involving part-time faculty in campus life as more challenging than the CIOs at private two-year colleges. The reason(s) for this finding is not clear. There is nothing in the literature or research on the topic that indicates public and private institutions face different challenges in implementing practices for effectively employing and utilizing part-time faculty. One possible explanation is found in previous discussion. As noted, there are fewer private (non-profit and for-profit) two-year colleges than public two-year colleges in the United States, 684 and 1,092, respectively. Additionally, there are substantially fewer two-year college students enrolled in privates than publics, 248,864 and 5,314,463, respectively ("1999-2000 Almanac Issue," 1999). In general, private colleges and universities utilize fewer part-time faculty than public colleges and universities; this is the case for private two-year colleges (National Center for Education Statistics, 1998). It may be that private two-year colleges experience less difficulty in recruiting part-time faculty simply because they are smaller than public community colleges, and, consequently, employ fewer part-timers. As a result, they may find it less challenging than public institutions to integrate part-timers into the campus culture.

The CIOs at public rural community colleges overwhelming perceived recruiting, selecting/hiring and orienting part-time faculty, and finding part-time faculty well versed in technology-based teaching and learning as more challenging than the CIOs at public urban and public suburban institutions. This finding supports the literature and research on the topic of part-time faculty at community colleges. Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron (1995, p. 45) found that "Colleges in or near large metropolitan areas have less difficulty recruiting and hiring part-time faculty than do colleges in more rural settings." They explained the effect of this finding on rural institutions:

> Large pools of available talent—for example, in and near large cities—will directly affect the dynamics of the pool; rural colleges may find recruiting and hiring much more difficult as the size and specialized skills of the pool are dramatically reduced (p. 46).

In this study, the CIOs from rural community colleges commented that the issues they face in implementing practices for employing part-time faculty are directly related to the geographic location of their institutions. One CIO noted, "Living in a very rural area has seriously hampered our ability to find qualified part-time instructors in many disciplines. The result is we simply offer fewer classes with corresponding enrollment drops, especially in the extension center." Another CIO stated, "We have a rural location. Quality part-timers are rarely available so we give overloads to full-time instructors and use local high school teachers to fill in." (See Appendix O for a list of the CIOs' suggestions and/or comments by Data Form Parts I, II, and III).

In addition to this finding, it is interesting to note that CIOs in the aggregate perceived selecting/hiring (M=2.32), evaluating (M=2.44), and retaining (M=2.36) part-time faculty as not a challenge. However, the CIOs at rural community colleges perceived implementing these practices as equally challenging as implementing the other practices. It is apparent from the findings of this study that rural community colleges face unique challenges that hinder their ability to implement commonly cited practices for effectively employing and utilizing part-time faculty.

5. CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges agree that commonly cited reasons for employing part-time faculty influence the decision to employ part-time faculty. This is the case regardless of the type of control and geographic location of their institutions.

On a Likert-type scale of 1 to 4, with a score less than 2.50 considered a non-affirmative response and a score of 2.50 or higher considered an affirmative response, the mean score for questionnaire items under Data Form Part III, which addressed the amount of influence commonly cited reasons for employing part-time faculty have on the decision to employ part-time faculty, was 2.96. There were no significant differences among the mean responses of the CIOs for individual questionnaire items regarding the reasons for employing part-time faculty. This was the case regardless of the type of control and geographic location of their institutions. It was also the case, with the exception of one small significant difference, regardless of the size of their institutions.

The findings revealed that the CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges, regardless of institutional type, agree that employing part-time faculty for the delivery of instruction is advantageous to the functioning and viability of their institutions: Part-time faculty afford institutional flexibility to match staffing to fluctuating enrollments, bring professional, current and practical experience to the classroom, and save on the costs of faculty salaries and benefits. The CIOs added that part-timers are employed because they provide linkages with the local community and because a sufficient number of full-time faculty are not available in their areas.

This finding is not surprising. The community college literature and research has long documented the advantages of employing and utilizing part-time faculty for the delivery of instruction. Proponents of employing part-time faculty contend that their use poses economic, practical and pedagogical benefits. These benefits include, but are not limited to (a) helping institutions meet their historical role of increasing access to higher education (Miller, 1992; Milliron, 1995; Osborn, 1990; Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1996a); (b) saving an institution money, in both salaries and benefits (Avakian, 1995; Mangan, 1991; McGuire, 1993; Osborn, 1990; Walker, 1998); (c) allowing institutions to be flexible in matching staffing to fluctuating enrollments (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Lankard, 1993; Osborn, 1990);

(d) bringing "real life vocational experience" into the classroom (Cline, 1993, p. 26; Cohen, 1992; Kelly, 1991; Littrell, 1990; McGuire, 1993); and,

(e) providing people who enjoy teaching an opportunity to teach (Cohen, 1992; Wilson, 1998).

6. There are no significant differences in the perceptions regarding the issues addressed in this study among CIOs at NCA-accredited rural community colleges based on the size of their institutions.

In this study, there were no significant differences in the perceptions of difficulty in meeting CIHE accreditation criteria for part-time faculty nor in the perceptions of challenge in implementing commonly cited practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty among the CIOs at rural NCA-accredited community colleges based on the size of their institutions. There was a small, but significant, difference in the perceptions of influential reasons for employing part-time faculty among the CIOs based on institutional size. The CIOs at small rural community colleges perceived saving on costs of faculty benefits as more influential on the decision to employ part-time faculty than their counterparts at medium and large rural community colleges.

This finding was surprising. As discussed in Chapter II, a number of researchers have documented differences in the issues faced by community colleges based on geographic location and institutional size (i.e., based on the number of students enrolled at the college) (Katsinas & Miller, 1998; Katsinas, 1993; Milam, 1995; Murphy, 1980; Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1995; Scheibmeir, 1980). Although the study findings support the argument that rural community colleges face unique challenges, it appears that institutional size may have less to do with those challenges than previously thought.

In exploring the possible reasons for this finding, the researcher reexamined the tool used in the study to organize rural institutions by size. The Katsinas & Lacey (1996)

Community College Classification System categorizes two-year colleges into 11 institutional types based on three major type of control categories: public, private, and federally chartered/special use. Institutions are further subcategorized within the public grouping based on their state assigned geographic location: rural, suburban, and urban. Within the rural grouping, public two-year colleges are subcategorized by size: small (Full-time equivalent students [FTE] < 1,000), medium (FTE=1,000 to 2,499), and large (FTE > 2,500).

The data in the three rural community college size subgroups, small, medium, and large were collapsed into two sets of two new categories and analyzed independently. The data in the small and medium subgroups were combined into one category (FTE<2,499) and compared to the data in the large subgroup (FTE>2,500). Similarly, the data in the medium and large subgroups were combined into one category (FTE>1,000) and compared to the data in the small subgroup (FTE<1,000). Still, there were no significant differences in the perceptions regarding the issues addressed in this study among CIOs based on the size of their institutions.

It is uncertain as to why the research findings do not support what has commonly been written and reported regarding the effect of size on the functioning of rural community colleges. Perhaps rural NCA-accredited community colleges face similar issues in the processes of meeting regional accreditation criteria for part-time faculty and employing and utilizing part-time faculty, regardless of institutional size.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are made from the findings of this study.

1. There are obvious differences in the perceptions regarding difficulty

in meeting CIHE accreditation criteria for part-time faculty among CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges based on institutional type.

The findings of this study revealed that CIOs on the average perceived meeting CIHE accreditation criteria for part-time faculty as less than difficult. However, differences in the perceptions regarding difficulty in meeting criteria existed among CIOs based on community college type, particularly by type of control and location. CIOs at public two-year colleges perceived ensuring that part-time faculty possess appropriate degrees and/or credentials as more difficult than CIOs at private and federally chartered/special use institutions. CIOs at public rural community colleges overwhelmingly perceived ensuring part-time faculty possess appropriate degrees and/or credentials as more difficult than CIOs at suburban and urban institutions.

The diversity found among American community colleges is supported by the findings of this study and other studies on the same topic. Murphy (1980) found a significant difference, at the .05 level of confidence, among community college districts regarding the level of policy incentives for part-time faculty, part-time faculty job satisfaction, and employment patterns of part-time faculty. Scheibmeir (1980) found that there were significantly fewer part-timers in rural community colleges than community colleges in urban settings and that wealthier college districts relied most heavily on part-time faculty. Milam (1995) analyzed U.S. Department of Education IPEDS data (1990-91 year) and found significant differences regarding access to part-time faculty between rural, suburban, and urban community colleges. Based on the results of a national study on the utilization of part-time faculty by American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) member institutions, Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron (1995) found that "Colleges operating in large, urban areas had fewer reasons [than those operating in small, rural areas] to be concerned with adequate numbers or specialized training and experiences in part-time faculty pools" (p. 47).

Undoubtedly, different types of community colleges have different experiences, and, subsequently, should be evaluated based on their uniqueness rather than a standardized set of norms. The NCA-CIHE is increasingly moving away from its reliance on standardized accreditation criteria and requirements, including those for faculty. In its recently released report, "Shaping the Commission's Future: The Mission Project Quest for Quality 2000 [working draft]," the Commission concluded that in the future "a key to accreditation will be that the Commission will look at an institution's own processes, assessing its success in achieving anticipated learning outcomes and accredit based on the integrity of those practices " (NCA-CIHE, 2000a, p. 6).

In recognition of this new direction in accreditation, NCA recently proposed an alternative process for reaccreditation. The Academic Quality Improvement Project (AQIP) is a quality driven approach to accreditation grounded on the same principles and perspectives that underlie many quality improvement program: Focus, involvement, leadership, learning, people, collaboration, agility, foresight, information, and integrity. Similar to the traditional NCA accreditation process, AQIP requires institutions to focus on internal improvement. Unlike the traditional philosophy of accreditation, however, AQIP also encourages colleges and universities to utilize information and comparative data from similar institutions to achieve a systematic approach to quality improvement. The new accreditation model recognizes the diversity found among colleges and universities, including community colleges. It also recognizes the benefits of encouraging faculty, staff, and administrators from like institutions to engage in meaningful dialogue about similar issues and problems in an effort to identify solutions and achieve successes.

2. The practices that contribute to the effective employment and utilization of part-time faculty are typically the same practices that pose the greatest challenge to CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges.

The community college literature has documented trends in the employment of part-time faculty at community colleges. Researchers overwhelming conclude that implementing effective strategies for recruiting, selecting/hiring, orienting, involving, and evaluating part-time faculty, and providing staff development for part-time faculty results in the employment of qualified part-time instructors and increased rates of retention among those instructors. (Biles & Tuckman, 1986; Burnstad & Wheeler, 1996; Gappa & Leslie 1993; Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1995).

Interesting to note is that the practices commonly identified as important for effectively employing part-time faculty are the same practices that CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges perceived as challenging to implement. Additionally, CIOs indicated that it is particularly difficult to find part-time faculty well versed in technology-based teaching and learning. This finding is particularly important to consider given the expanding use of technology in teaching and learning (Vaughn, 2000). The Committee of the New Expeditions initiative—a joint project of the American Association of Community Colleges and the Association of Community College Trustees supported by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation—was charged with identifying current issues and offering a vision for the future of community colleges. The Committee recommended, "Community colleges must help faculty understand and integrate technology as an essential learning tool" (Report of the New Expeditions Coordinating Committee, 2000, p. 19). This recommendation should be extended to both full- and part-time faculty, considering that 65% of the faculty at community colleges are part-time employees.

The challenge to increase institutional resources dedicated to the improvement of employing part-time faculty is posed to administrators at NCA-accredited community colleges, and community colleges nation wide. Further, the challenge to commit more dollars, in the form of grants and annual budgetary allocations to institutions who provide a comprehensive plan for improving the process of employing part-time faculty, is posed to the federal and state governments.

3. Regardless of institutional type, CIOs at community colleges accredited by the NCA perceive the same basic reasons for employing part-time faculty as influential on the decision to employ part-time faculty.

As supported by the higher education literature and research and the findings of this study, employing part-time faculty is beneficial to the functioning and viability of community colleges. Part-time faculty are employed by community colleges to deliver instruction because the practice affords institutional flexibility in meeting staffing to fluctuating enrollments, brings professional and current and practical experience into the classroom, and saves on the costs of faculty salaries and benefits.

To date, most research on the topic of part-time faculty has focused on their status in terms of numbers and percentages in comparison to full-time faculty. Typically, such data have been used to support on-going efforts to reduce the number of part-time faculty in community colleges. Until and unless the costs of employing part-time faculty surpass the benefits, it is unlikely that those efforts will succeed. It is much more likely that community colleges will benefit from the results of research designed to identify effective practices for improving the employment of part-time faculty. Such research should include comprehensive qualitative investigations that are based upon the findings of quantitative studies that employed representative and stratified sampling procedures and make appropriate comparisons of peer institutions facing similar challenges.

4. Community colleges are inherently distinct, yet classifiable.

As applied to this study, the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare differences among the responses of CIOs between and within the levels of the factor community college type (i.e., between and within community college type categories). In the cases where differences between subgroups tested significant ($p<.05$) but differences within subgroups did not, it was concluded that the perceptions of CIOs between community college type categories were significantly different from one another, while the perceptions of CIOs within community college type categories were not. In this study, where significant differences ($p<.05$) were found to exist among the CIOs' responses, the differences existed between subgroups, not within subgroups. This was true in every case. Undoubtedly, community colleges are distinct, yet classifiable.

The results of this study provide evidence to support the need to recognize institutional diversity among community college types; a conclusion recognized by practitioners but ignored by researchers. For example, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching recently made public the fourth revision to its system for classifying postsecondary institutions. According to Foundation officials, Carnegie is revising its classification system because "the information used in the last classification in

1994 is 'way out of date' (Basinger, 2000, p. A31). Similar to the Carnegie classifications of the past, however, the current proposal for revision to the scheme ignores a number of facts: (a) two-year colleges make up nearly 43% of all institutions within the preliminary scheme; (b) 377 of the 500 institutions new to the 2000 classification specialize in associate level programs; and, (c) the existing higher education literature and research supports the unique nature of community colleges based on type of control, location, and size. In the first draft of the fourth revision, all types of community colleges are again considered one and the same, namely "associate's colleges" (see Table 37).

The system distorts the distinctive nature of associate degree granting colleges by collapsing some of this type and some baccalaureate degree granting colleges into the same category, namely "baccalaureate/associate's colleges." This category includes institutions that "are undergraduate colleges with significant baccalaureate programs; however, the majority of conferrals are at the sub-baccalaureate level (associate degrees and certificates)" (Basinger, 2000, p. A35). The use of the baccalaureate/ associate's college category ignores the traditional differentiation of colleges and universities by highest degree awarded, thereby blurring institutional missions and functions.

Table 37

The Carnegie Classification System for Institutions of Higher Education (U.S.) by Major Category and Subcategory, and Proportion of Institutions by Carnegie Classification, 2000

Major Category Subcategory	Percent of All Carnegie Colleges

Doctoral-Granting Institutions		
Doctoral/Research Universities-Extensive	3.8%	
Doctoral/Research Universities-Intensive	2.9%	
Master's (Comprehensive) Colleges and Universities)		
Master's Colleges and Universities I	12.7%	
Master's Colleges and Universities II	3.3%	
Baccalaureate Colleges		
Baccalaureate Colleges-Liberal Arts	5.5%	
Baccalaureate Colleges-General		8.0%
Baccalaureate Colleges/Associates Colleges	1.3%	
Associate's Colleges	42.5%	
Specialized Institutions		19.2%
Tribal Colleges and Universities	0.7%	
Total		100.0%

Source: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as cited in Julianne Basinger. (2000, August 11). Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A31-42.

The Carnegie system further distorts the distinctive nature of two-year colleges by failing to recognize those serving special populations. Two Carnegie Classification categories—"specialized institutions" and "tribal colleges and universities"—are similar to the "special use/federally chartered" subcategory in the Katsinas & Lacey (1996) Community College Classification System. However, in the Carnegie scheme these categories are reserved for institutions that offer degrees ranging from the bachelor's to the doctorate. Two-year tribal colleges are not even acknowledged.

There is hope for the future. Alexander C. McCormick, a senior scholar at the Carnegie Foundation who supervised the latest classification of American higher education, acknowledged that the new groupings have flaws, and that the 2000 classification is an interim step toward another revision of the system in 2005. He stated that "Our 2005 edition will have a much more flexible system…It wouldn't really be hard for someone to get other data to create more relevant distinctions" (Basinger, 2000, A31). The results of this study provide evidence to support the need to reexamine how community colleges are currently studied and offer data that may be used to create what McCormick refers to as "more relevant distinctions" between community college types. A classification scheme that blurs institutional differences, such as the Carnegie System, diminishes its usefulness as a research tool. This is an important point because in the absence of empirical data, policies affecting American community colleges will be made on anecdote.

5. Rural community colleges face unique challenges.

Regardless of size, rural two-year colleges face unique challenges not faced by other types of institutions, namely suburban and urban two-year colleges (Eller, Martinez, Pace, Pavel, Garza, & Barnett, 1998; Katsinas & Miller, 1998; Killacky & Valadez, 1995). In this study, CIOs at rural NCA-accredited community colleges perceived meeting criteria for part-time faculty and implementing effective practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty as more difficult and challenging, respectively, than CIOs at other types of community colleges. Specifically, CIOs at rural community colleges perceived meeting regional accreditation criteria for employing and utilizing part-time faculty as much more difficult than CIOs at suburban and urban community colleges. Additionally, they perceived implementing effective practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty as much more challenging than CIOs at suburban and urban community colleges.

The unique challenges faced by two-year colleges in economically distressed areas supports a need to reexamine the way in which community colleges are studied. Since their inception into the American system of higher education at the turn of the 20th century, the primary goal of community colleges has been to provide access to historically disadvantaged populations. Rural community colleges are quite often located in economically distressed areas. Until the 1980s, the economic well-being of the people living in rural areas was dependent on agriculture and manufacturing, both of which have been in significant decline as a result of agricultural mechanization and natural resource depletion. More recently, global competition and technology have increased unemployment in rural areas, resulting in "rural flight" and poverty.

Efforts to revive the rural economy have tended to focus on increasing access to education and economic development. Two-year colleges quite often are seen as the primary agents behind the revival efforts (Katsinas & Miller, 1998). A lack of financial resources, both for students and the institutions, present important challenges to colleges serving distressed areas. The strategies designed to address these difficulties and challenges may be appropriate for urban and suburban areas, yet prove highly inadequate for rural communities (Eller, Martinez, Pace, Pavel, Garza, & Barnett, 1998.) This conclusion supports the need to identify and validate a comprehensive system for classifying community colleges. This finding also supports the need to identify "best practices," differentiated by community college type, for addressing common issues and problems related to the effective employment and utilization of part-time faculty.

The results of this study, coupled with the unique challenges faced by two-year colleges in economically distressed areas, supports a need to reexamine the way in which community colleges are currently subsidized by the federal and state governments. Currently, subsidy is based on full-time student equivalent (FTE). Rural community colleges are typically located in areas characterized by low population density and geographic isolation. The result is low student enrollment and, subsequently, low state subsidy support. In order for rural community colleges to successfully revitalize economically distressed areas, any attempts to create and/or change public higher education funding policies must first take into account the diverse geographic locations of the institutions affected by such policies.

Recommendations for Further Research

Several recommendations for improving and expanding the literature and research on the topics of part-time faculty at community colleges and the North Central postsecondary accreditation process—as conducted by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) to assess the overall quality of faculty and effectiveness of teaching at member institutions—were developed from the issues that emerged in the process of conducting this investigation. Some of the recommendations are directly related to the scope of the study, while others are indirectly related to the general topic of part-time faculty and regional accreditation. These recommendations are presented below.

Recommendation 1

A review of the qualitative data in this study, including the participants' suggestions for improving the study and general comments written directly on the questionnaire, revealed that the definition of part-time faculty is ambiguous. In their written comments, chief instructional officers (CIOs) interchangeably used the terms "part-time" and "adjunct" to refer to faculty who teach less than full-time.

The definition of part-time faculty used in this study, which was presented under the section titled "Definitions" in Chapter I, is consistent with the definition used by the U.S. Department of Education in its research (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 1998). The Department of Education defines part-time faculty as "Persons on the payroll of the institution (or reporting unit) and classified by the institution as part-time." It defines adjunct faculty as "A faculty position where one has an occasional or temporary affiliation with an institution or another faculty member in performing a duty or service in an auxiliary capacity" (NCES, 1998, Glossary, Section S). In recognizing the distinction between the two terms, it is quite conceivable that adjunct faculty may or may not be employed on a part-time basis.

It is recommended that research on the topic of part-time faculty develop and utilize clear and precise definitions for the terms related to faculty status. Studies that fail to do so result in ambiguous findings. This is frequently found to be the case in the research that delineates the number and percentage of part-time faculty in comparison to full-time faculty. The difference between part-time and adjunct faculty should be agreed upon and shared among the higher education community.

Recommendation 2

The data in this study revealed that many of the key issues surrounding the employment and utilization of part-time faculty revolve around the differentiation between vocational and academic courses and programs. Several CIOs in this study indicated that the survey questions, and the subsequent findings, would be more informative if distinctions were made between part-time faculty teaching general education/transfer courses and those teaching vocational courses. Additionally, CIOs indicated that the amount of difficulty experienced in meeting CIHE accreditation criteria for part-time faculty is dependent on the type of instructional program and whether the instructors are teaching credit or noncredit courses.

The findings of this study suggest that it is more difficult to ensure part-time faculty teaching occupational courses hold bachelor's degrees than to ensure part-time faculty teaching general education courses hold master's degrees. Additionally, CIOs indicated that the amount of difficulty experienced in finding qualified instructors is dependent on the type of courses they are attempting to staff. They noted that similar issues emerge in staffing credit and noncredit courses. It may be that practitioners experience little or no difficulty ensuring that instructors teaching credit courses hold appropriate degrees, but experience greater difficulty ensuring the same for instructors teaching noncredit courses.

This issues needs to be explored in greater detail. Additional research should be conducted to examine the relationship between part-time faculty staffing issues—particularly the availability of faculty and faculty credentials—and the type of program and/or credit status of courses that institutions are attempting to staff. This issue could be examined simply by modifying the survey instrument used to collect the data in this study. A bifurcated survey that incorporates two response categories, one for the answers to questions as they relate to staffing general education/transfer courses and another for answering the same questions as they relate to staffing vocational courses, would yield results that address this issue. Likewise, the same format as applied to staffing credit and noncredit courses would yield enlightening information.

Recommendation 3

The Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) applies the same criteria to all faculty, regardless of status (i.e., full- or part-time employment status) (NCA-CIHE, 1997f). Similarly, most institutional practices and policies regarding minimum academic credentials are applied equally to full-and part-time faculty (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). It would be interesting to examine whether CIOs have the same perceptions if applied to the employment and utilization of full-time faculty. With few modifications—for example, removing Data Form Part III, which assessed the perceptions of CIOs regarding the amount of influence commonly cited reasons for employing part-time faculty have on the decision to employ part-time faculty—the same population, research method, questionnaire, data collection procedures, and statistical tests for analyzing the data used to examine the employment and utilization of part-time faculty could be used to examine the same issues as they apply to full-time faculty.

Recommendation 4

The findings of this study indicated that different types of two-year colleges face different issues and problems based on type of control and geographic location. It is recommended, therefore, that community college researchers employ stratified sampling procedures rather than simply study institutions in the aggregate. Doing so will likely yield data that can be used to support the existence of diversity among two-year colleges. This type of research is timely and important. In the absence of empirical evidence to support the need for recognizing institutional distinctiveness, current efforts to classify American institutions of higher education will continue to ignore the diverse nature of two-year colleges, as exemplified by the recently proposed revisions to the Carnegie system for classifying American institutions of higher education. Further, in the absence of such evidence, policy-makers will likely continue to create and implement policies that ignore the impact of diversity on institutional functioning and viability. Finally, failure to support the need for recognizing the differences among two-year colleges will prolong the acceptance of the erroneous assumption that all two-year colleges face the same issues and, as a result, benefit from employing the same strategies to resolve problems.

Along the same lines, it recommended that researchers consider the relationship between institutional mission and purposes and the diversity that exists among American two-year colleges. It is well known that two-year technical and two-year community colleges have different missions, and, in some cases, serve different students and different communities. Yet, the terms "two-year college" and "community college" are frequently used interchangeably to organize all institutions whose highest degree awarded is an associate degree, including the associate of arts, the associate of science, and/or the associate of applied science into one category.

The "lumping" of two-year institutions was, in fact, a limitation of this study. The words "community college" and "two-year college" were used interchangeably throughout the study. The Katsinas & Lacey (1996) Community College Classification System, which was used to organize the data in the study, classifies all two-year colleges as community colleges. Further, the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA), which was the focus of this investigation, makes no distinction between two-year college types, instead combining all institutions that award the associate of arts, associate of science, and/or associate of applied science degrees into one group, regardless of whether the institution is a community college or a technical college.

The research and literature on two-year colleges would be greatly enhanced if, in addition to recognizing institutional diversity on the basis of type of control, geographic location, and size, differences in institutional mission and purpose were recognized and studied. The data collected for this study could easily be organized and analyzed by two-year college type, namely community colleges and technical colleges.

Recommendation 5

The independent variables in this study included institutional type of control, geographical location, and size. It would be interesting to examine the effect of other variables on the perceptions of CIOs regarding the utilization and employment of part-time faculty. This could be done without much difficulty using the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) data base, the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). IPEDS is a single, comprehensive system that encompasses all identified postsecondary education institutions. It consists of institutional level data that can be used to describe trends in higher education at the institutional, state, and/or national levels. Some of the factors that may be considered in further examining the issues addressed in this study include: (a) financial statistics such as institutional revenue and expenditure patterns by source of income and type of expense; (b) staff data, including full- to part-time faculty ratios; and (c) demographic data such as race/ethnicity and sex of faculty, staff, and students.

Recommendation 6

Critics of employing part-time faculty for the delivery of instruction at two-year colleges commonly contend that part-time faculty are less qualified and, consequently, are less effective instructors than full-time faculty (Ashford, 1993; Ashworth, 1988; Astin, 1993; Clark, 1988, 1993; Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, 1988; Conference on College Composition and Communication, 1989; Fedler, 1989; Franklin, 1994; Friedlander, 1979; Goldberg, 1990; Kemp, 1994; Law, 1987; Mojock, 1990; Samuel, 1989; Selvadurai, 1990; Spangler, 1990; Thompson, 1992; Williams, 1995; Wright, 1995). However, there is no empirical evidence in the higher education literature to substantiate or negate the claim that part-time faculty are either less competent or less effective than full-time faculty (Banachowski, 1996; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Lolly, 1980; Rifkin, 1997; Weintraub, 1975 cited in Lombardi, 1992; Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1995; Washington State Board of Community and Technical Colleges, 1998; Willett, 1980). This is likely the case because there is no know tool for measuring “quality” or "effectiveness.”

The issue of quality and effectiveness can only be addressed indirectly. As previously discussed, researchers have compared the competency of full-time and part-time faculty using variables such as academic credentials and teaching experience. Similarly, studies have examined differences in teaching effectiveness between part-time and full-time faculty by assessing student evaluations, grades and retention rates. Still, the definitions for quality and effectiveness are ambiguous. A valid and reliable tool for measuring these terms, which are frequently used to critique the practice of employing part-time faculty, is desperately needed. Unless such an instrument is developed and utilized to examine the attributes of part-time and full-time faculty, erroneous assumptions about the differences between the two will continue to plague the higher education literature and research.

A tool for assessing quality of faculty should certainly include those attributes mentioned above, namely academic credentials and teaching experience. Some additional variables could be considered, such as professional experience, membership in professional associations, professional development activities, verbal and written communication skills, and presentation skills. Similarly, a tool for assessing effective teaching should include those attributes discussed above, namely student evaluations, grades and retention rates. However, a number of other variables may be valid and reliable indicators of teaching effectiveness, including: (a) willingness to spend time with students; (b) degree of student "centeredness;" (c) adaptability, flexibility, and creativity; (d) motivational skills; (e) understanding and appreciation of student diversity (in terms of both personal characteristics and learning styles); and, (f) degree of community involvement.

Recommendation 7

Comprehensive qualitative studies are needed to examine the issues that emerged in the process of conducting this investigation. It is important to identify whether or not CIOs experience difficulty in meeting regional accreditation criteria for part-time faculty. It is also important to examine the challenges experienced in implementing effective practices for employing part-time faculty. It is most important to determine whether or not difficulty and challenge differ by community college type. However, additional research is needed to answer the question "why": Why is it difficult for two-year colleges to meet accreditation criteria?; Why is it challenging for two-year colleges to implement effective practices for employing part-time faculty?; Why are certain factors more influential than others on the decision to employ part-time faculty?; and, Why do different types of two-year colleges experience different amounts of difficulty and challenge?

In order to fully benefit from the results of this study, it is recommended that additional research be conducted to identify "best practices" for employing and utilizing part-time faculty at community colleges, differentiated by institutional type. Using the data collected in this study, it would be very easy to identify those institutions experiencing the least amount of difficulty in meeting regional accreditation criteria for part-time faculty and the least amount of challenge in implementing practices for effectively employing and utilizing part-time faculty. The CIOs from these institutions could be interviewed in an attempt to identify common patterns of behavior and practice that contribute to the successful use of part-time faculty. The findings, delineated by institutional type, should be shared with the higher education community, particularly practitioners at two-year colleges who are responsible for supervising the employment and utilization of part-time faculty.

Recommendation 8

The findings of this study indicated that the criteria used by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) may not be effective indices for assessing the quality of part-time faculty and effectiveness of instruction delivered by part-time faculty at two-year member institutions. The criteria are based on a standardized set of norms applied equally not only to all types of two-year colleges but to all colleges an universities in general. The other five higher education regional accrediting bodies—including the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges—currently utilize a similar system for accrediting colleges and universities.

It would be interesting to identify and compare the perceptions of CIOs at two-year colleges across the country regarding the issues addressed in this study. With the exception of reconstructing the questionnaire items under Data Form Part I, which were developed from the NCA-CIHE Criteria for Accreditation and General Institutional Requirements (GIRs), researchers could very easily adopt the methods for collecting and analyzing the data used in this study to conduct similar studies of other regions or the nation as a whole. The implications of the data would be more powerful if it revealed that two-year colleges across the country experience similar issues and problems related to the utilization and employment of part-time faculty.

Closing Remarks

Higher education accreditors are ultimately responsible for judging the quality and effectiveness of instruction delivered at member institutions. However, the country's regional system of voluntary accreditation for colleges and universities frequently comes under attack for being inadequate and self-serving (Ewell, 1994; National Policy Board on Higher Education Institutional Accreditation, 1994; Palinchak, 1993). Recently, a part-time faculty member employed by four community colleges in the state of Washington filed a complaint with the U.S. Department of Education asking for an investigation of the state's regional higher education accreditor, the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges. He claimed that the Association was accrediting community colleges that did not meet its accreditation criteria for part-time faculty (Leatherman, 1997).

As a result of the Washington state case, and the occurrence of similar cases nation wide, states are passing, or at least considering passing, legislation to mandate full-time to part-time faculty ratios and measures designed to foster the improvement of the process related to the employment and evaluation of part-time faculty. Despite such pressures, higher education regional accrediting bodies have rightly shied away from mandating full-time to-part-time faculty ratios. The higher education literature and research on the topic of part-time faculty at community colleges has found that effective or quality instruction cannot be discerned by the full-time or part-time status of instructors. Further, the literature and research is unable to support any relationship between the number of part-time faculty and the quality of instruction at an institution. The fact that the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (NCA-CIHE) applies the same accreditation criteria and requirements to all faculty, regardless of status, supports their belief that instructional quality has little to do with type or level of faculty status.

In their book, Strangers in their own land: Part-time faculty in American community colleges, Roueche, Roueche & Milliron (1995) concluded:

> Part-time faculty have critical contributions to make to teaching and learning in the higher education enterprise—educationally, socially, and economically. For the contributions and the extraordinary potential they bring, part-timers should be acknowledged and treated as valuable citizens of the academic community (p. 255).

Despite the benefits of employing part-time faculty, attempts are being made to deter their use. These efforts appear in the general environment of academe, and formally in state laws, institutional policies, and collective bargaining agreements. Attempts to curtail the use of part-time faculty causes great concern, especially since these efforts are being made on the basis of unsubstantiated claims that their use poses more harm than good.

With the loss of part-time faculty, community colleges will suffer economically and pedagogically. If a valuable pool of talented professionals are forced to leave the classroom they will take with them one of the historically fundamental purposes of the two-year college, that is to provide a practical education. Perhaps of greater concern is that part-timers themselves will suffer as they leave the classroom without being recognized as valuable participants in the American system of higher education.

It is in the best interest of the two-year college community to focus efforts away from the status of part-time faculty in terms of numbers and percentages toward the identification of meaningful and effective strategies for strengthening the employment and utilization of part-time faculty. Simply recognizing that different community colleges experience different issues in the process of employing part-time faculty is a starting point. It is hoped that the results of this study will be used to investigate effective strategies for improving the employment and utilization of part-time faculty rather than to support the political battles between those in favor of and those against their use for the delivery of instruction at community colleges.

References

"1999-2000" Almanac Issue." (1999). The Chronicle of Higher Education. [Online]. Available: http://chronicle.com/weekly/almanac/1999.

"2000-2001 Almanac Issue." (2000). The Chronicle of Higher Education. [Online]. Available: http://chronicle.com/weekly/almanac/2000.

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. (1990). Accreditation: Evaluating the collective faculty. Sacramento, CA: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED 318 524.)

"Accrediting standards regarding part-time instructors..." (1997, November 7). The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. B13.

Akroyd, D., Cameron, D. W., Gillett-Karam, R. & Parsons, M. H. (1998, April). Part-time faculty: A national profile and institutional initiatives. Paper presented at the 78th Annual Convention of the American Association of Community Colleges, Miami Beach, FL.

Allysen, T. (1996, June). A paradigm shift: Recruiting, training, and developing quality part-time faculty. Paper presented at the 6th Annual Teaching for a Change Conference, Aurora, CO.

American Association of Community Colleges. (1995). National profile of community colleges: Trends and statistics, 1995-1996. Washington, DC: Community College Press.

_____. (1997a). National profile of community colleges: Trends and statistics, 1997-1998. Washington, DC: Community College Press.

_____. (1997b). Computer technology at community colleges. Research Brief

(RB-97-92). Washington, DC: Author.

_____. (1998a). The American Association of Community Colleges classification system: By type of governance and number. Office of Research. Washington, DC: Author.

_____. (1998b). AACC Annual, 1998-99. State-by-state analysis of community colleges: Trends and statistics. Washington, DC: Author.

______. (2000). Number of community colleges, 1998. Washington, DC: Author. [On-line]. Available: www.aacc.nche.edu/anaboutcc/enrollment.num

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (1955-1988 [published annually]). Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory. Washington, DC: Author.

American Association of University Professors. (1998, April 1). Statement from the conference on the growing use of part-time and adjunct faculty. [On-line]. Available: http://www.igc.apc.org/aaup/ ptconf.htm

American Federation of Teachers (1998a, June 19). Statement on part-time faculty employment [in higher education. [On-line]. Available: http://www.aft.org.higheduc/parttime.htm

Ashford, G. B. (1993). Perceptions of administrators, full-time faculty, and part-time faculty regarding the economic implications of the future of part-time faculty in Alabama's state community colleges. Ed.D. Thesis, The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama . Dissertation Abstracts International, UMI# AAI9403327.

Ashworth, T. E. (1988). Improving the effectiveness of part-time faculty in community colleges. Community Services Catalyst 18(3), 15-18.

Astin, A.W. (1975). Preventing students from dropping out. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

_____. (1993). What matters in college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Avakian, A. N. (1995). Conflicting demands for adjunct faculty. Community College Review, 65(6), 34-36. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. EJ 507 119.)

Babbie, E. (1992). The practice of social research (6th edition). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

_____. (1998). The practice of social research (8th edition). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Banachowski, G. (1996). ERIC Review: Perspectives and perceptions: The use of part-time faculty in community colleges. Community College Review 24(2), 49-62.

Barber, S. P. (1990). An examination of accreditation: Views held by the key participants. Ed.D. Thesis, Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbuilt. Dissertation Abstracts International, UMI# AAI9027442.

Basinger, J. (2000, August 11). A new way of classifying colleges elates some and perturbs others. Chronicle of Higher Education, p. A31, A34-A42.

Beder, H. (1992). The use of adjunct faculty in the community college: A grounded theory analysis. Ed.D. Thesis, Rutgers State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick, NJ. Dissertation Abstracts International, UMI# AAT9320790.

Benjamin, E. (1994, July-August). From accreditation to regulation: The decline of academic autonomy in higher education. Academe, p. 36.

Biles, G. E. & Tuckman, H.P. (1986). Part-time faculty personnel management policies. New York: American Council on Education and Macmillan.

Bogartz, R. S. (1994). An introduction to the analysis of variance. Westport, CN: Praeger.

Boggs, G. R. (1984). An evaluation of the instructional effectiveness of part-time community college developmental writing faculty. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

Bolge, R. D. (1995). Examination of student learning as a function of instructor status (full-time verses part-time) at Mercer County Community College. Trenton, NJ: Mercer Community College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED 382 241.)

Burnstad, H. & Wheeler, D. (1996). Part-time faculty: Crucial, yet how to involve them more effectively. Academic Leadership 4(1), 23-24.

California Community Colleges. (1987). Study of part-time instruction. Offices of the Chancellor. Sacramento, CA: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 278 449.)

_____. (1988). AB 1725, IV: Part-time faculty. Board of Governors. Sacramento, CA: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED 287 531.)

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1973). A classification of institutions of higher education. (A Carnegie Foundation Technical Report.) Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

_____. (1976). A classification of institutions of higher education. (A Carnegie Foundation Technical Report.) Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

_____. (1987). A classification of institutions of higher education. (A Carnegie Foundation Technical Report.) Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

_____. (1994). A classification of institutions of higher education. (A Carnegie

Foundation Technical Report.) Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Carnegie Foundation to overhaul its college-classification system. (1998, May 8). Chronicle of Higher Education, p. A1.

Carroll, S. (1994). Questionnaire design affects response rate. Marketing News, 28(12), 25-30.

Clark, B. R. (1988, March). The absorbing errand. Remarks presented at the National Conference of the American Association of Higher Education. Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED 352 095.)

_____. (1993). Faculty: Differentiation and dispersion. In A. Levine (Ed.), Higher learning in America: 1980-2000 (pp. 163-178). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Cline, L. (1993). Work to school transition: Part-time faculty bring expertise, challenges to college. Vocational Education Journal, 68(2), 26-27, 49.

Cohen, A. M. & Brawer, F. B. (1996). The American community college (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, M. C. (1992, November). Benefits on a budget. Paper presented at the 78th Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED 355 578.)

Commission on the Future of Community Colleges. (1988). Building community : A vision for a new century. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED 293 578.)

Conference on College Composition and Communication. (1989). Statement of principles and standards for the postsecondary teaching of writing. College Composition and Communication 40(3), 329-337.

Council for Higher Education Accreditation. (1996a, August). The Council for Higher Education Accreditation. The CHEA Chronicle, 1 , 1-2. [On-line]. Available: http//www.chea.org/Perspective/chronicle1.htm

_____. (1996b, Fall). What is accreditation. The CHEA Chronicle, 2, 1-3. [On-line]. Available: http://www.chea.org/Perspective/chronicle2.htm

_____. (1997a). Report of June 1997 Chicago meeting: Enhancing the usefulness of specialized/professional accreditation. [On-line]. Available http://www.chea.org/About /97/Report/ summary.html

_____. (1997b, November). Higher education reauthorization. The CHEA Chronicle, 7, 1-3. [On-line]. Available: http://www.chea.org/ Perspective/chronicle7.htm

_____. (1998a, April 17). About CHEA. [On-line]. Available: http://www.chea. org/About/index.html

Cresswell, J. W. (1994). Research design: Qualitative & quantitative approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Davis, C. O. (1945). A history of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Publication Office.

Digranes, J. L & Digranes, S. H. (1995). Current and proposed uses of technology for training part-time faculty. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 19(2), 161-69.

Dillman, D. A. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Eaton, J. S. (1994). Strengthening collegiate education in community colleges.

San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Eells, W. C. (1931). The junior college. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Eller, R. Martinez, R., Pace, C., Pavel, M., Garza, H., Barnett, L. (1998). Rural community college initiative I. Access: Removing barriers to participation. American Association of Community Colleges Project Brief 98-1. Washington, DC: Author.

Engleberg, I. N . (1993, November). The emerging professoriate in community colleges. Paper presented at the 79th Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Miami Beach, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED 368 020.)

Ewell, P. T. (1994, November-December). A matter of integrity: Accountability and the future of self-regulation. Change, 25-29.

Fabisinski, N. M. (1994). The role of part-time faculty in Alabama community college English departments: Perceptions of administrators and part-time teachers. Ph.D. Thesis, The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa. Dissertation Abstracts International, UMI# AAI9429223.

Fedler, F. (1989). Adjunct profs grade higher than faculty at three schools. Journalism Education, 44(2), 32-37.

Foddy, W. (1993). Constructing questions for interviews and questionnaires: Theory and practice in social research. Cambridge: University Press.

Fowler, F. J., Jr. (1992). How unclear terms affect survey data. Public Opinion Quarterly, 56(2), 218-232.

Franklin, J. W. (1994). The attributes, teaching effectiveness, and educational commitment of part-time faculty in North Carolina community colleges. Ed.D. Thesis, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee. Dissertation Abstracts

International, UMI# AAI9502659.

Freeland, R. S. (1998, November). Adjunct faculty in the community college. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED 424 899.)

Friedlander, J. (1979, May). Instructional practices of part-time faculty in community colleges. Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, San Diego, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED 169 971.)

Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. W. (1993). The invisible faculty: Improving the status of part-timers in higher education. San Francisco: CA: Jossey Bass.

Goldberg, E. D. (1990). Selection and support of part-time faculty in Illinois community colleges: A study of the processes that promote quality instruction. Ph.D. Thesis, Northwestern University, Chicago, Illinois. Dissertation Abstracts International, UMI# AAI9031908.

Gordon, C. E. (1990). Professional development need beliefs of part-time teachers of English. Ph.D. Thesis, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio. Dissertation Abstracts International, UMI# AAI9104028.

Hinkle, D.E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (1994). Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences. Geneva, Illinois: Houghton Mifflin.

Iadevaia, D. G. (1991). A comparison of full-time to part-time faculty and full-time to part-time science faculty in terms of student success at Pima Community College. Ed.D. Major Applied Research Project, Nova University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED 339 403.)

Ikenberry, S. O. (1997). Defining a new agenda: Higher education and the future of America. NCA Quarterly, 71(4), 445-450.

Jackson, J. (1988). The relationship between part-time faculty and full-time faculty ratios and selected variables in Illinois community colleges. Ph.D. Thesis, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Carbondale, Illinois. Dissertation Abstracts International, UMI# AAI8909333.

Jaschik, S. (1992, August 5). Reauthorization Act says accreditors must monitor campuses compliance with the rules on student aid. The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. A15.

Johns, J. R. (1993). The duties and responsibilities of chief academic officers at selected community colleges. Ph.D. Thesis, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio. Dissertation Abstracts International, UMI# AAI8816768.

Katsinas, S. G. & Lacey, V. A. (1996). A classification of community colleges in the United States: A technical report (Prepared for the Ford Foundation Education and Culture Program, Grant Number 930-579). Unpublished Manuscript.

Katsinas, S. G. & Miller, M. T. (1998). Vocational education in rural community colleges: Strategic issues and problems. Journal of Vocational Education Research 23(2), 159-167.

Katsinas, S. G. (1993, April). Toward a classification system for community colleges. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Council of Universities and Colleges, Portland, OR. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED 377 925.)

_____. (1996, Fall). Preparing leaders for diverse institutional settings. New Directions for Community Colleges 24(3), 15-25.

Kelly, D. K. (1991, May). Part-time faculty in the community college: A study of their qualifications, frustrations, and involvement. Paper presented at the 31st Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED 336 035.)

Kemp, T. (1994). Student interaction with part-time and full-time faculty in introductory economics courses. Ph.D. Thesis, University of North Texas, Denton, Texas. Dissertation Abstracts International, UMI # AAI9517625.

Kienzl, G. & Li, Y. (1997). Computer technology at community colleges. Research Brief (RB-97-2). Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Killacky, J. & Valadez, J. R. (Eds.). (1995, Summer). Portrait of the Rural Community College. New Directions for Community Colleges 23(2).

Lankard, B. A. (1993). Part-time instructors in adult and vocational education. Washington, DC: Office of Education Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED 363 797.)

Law, F. W. (1987). A comparative analysis of teaching effectiveness between part-time and full-time faculty in selected two-year colleges. Ph.D. Thesis, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio. Dissertation Abstracts International, UMI# AAI8725883.

Leatherman, C. (1997, October 10). Growing use of part-time professors prompts debate and calls for action. The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. A14.

Lee, J. (1997). Part-time employment in academe. Nea Higher Education Research Center Update 3(1).

Leslie, D. W., Kellams, S. E., & Gunne, G. M. (1982). Part-time faculty in American higher education. New York, NY: Praeger.

Leslie, D. W. (1998, May). Part-time, adjunct, and temporary faculty: The new majority. Report of the Sloan Conference on Part-Time and Adjuct Faculty, December 2-3, 1997, Arlington, VA.

Littrell, J. L. (1990, January). Occupational training for the real world: Bridging the classroom to corporation gap. Proceedings of the National Conference on Professional Development of Part-time Occupational/Technical Faculty. Washington, DC: Office of Vocational and Adult Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no.ED 326 294.)

Lively, K. (1999, November 5). Changes planned for Carnegie Classification: Research and doctoral universities will be combined in new category. The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. A46.

Locke, L. F., Spirduso, W. W., & Silverman, S. J. (1993). Proposals that work: A guide for planning dissertations and grant proposals (3rd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Loether, H. J. & McTavish, D. G. (1980). Descriptive & inferential statistics: An introduction (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Lolly, J. L. (1980). A comparison of the use of instructional resources by full- and part-time teachers. Community/Junior College Research Quarterly 5(1), 47-51.

Lombardi, J. (1992). The ambiguity of the part-time faculty. In J. Lombardi & A. M. Cohen (Eds.), Perspectives on the community college: Essays (pp. 51-67). Washington, DC: American Council on Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED 349 041.)

Longanecker, D. A. (1994, July-August). The new federal focus on accreditation. Academe, 13-27.

Makowski, D. & Wulfsberg, R. M. (1982). An improved taxonomy of postsecondary institutions. Report No. HE 017 555. Washington, D. C. National Institute of Educational Policy and Organization.

Mangan, K. S. (1991, August 7). Many colleges fill vacancies with part-time professors, citing economy and uncertainty about enrollments. The Chronicle of Higher Education, A9-10.

McGuire, J. (1993). Part-time faculty: Partners in excellence. Leadership Abstracts, 6(6), 1-3.

Milam, P. (1995, December)- Toward a Carnegie-style classification system for publicly controlled community colleges. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma.

Millard, R. (1983, May/June). The accrediting association: Ensuring the quality of programs and institutions. Change, 34-36.

Miller, D. S. (1992). The impact of the preponderance of part-time faculty on the mission of the community college. Ph.D. Thesis, The University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona. Dissertation Abstracts International, UMI# AAI9223568.

Milliron, M. D. (1995). Toward a model of part-time faculty integration in American community colleges. Ph.D. Thesis, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas. Dissertation Abstracts International, UMI# AAI9534895.

Mojock, C. R. (1990). An investigation of the characteristics of part-time faculty in Florida community colleges. Ed.D.Thesis, University of Central Florida, Orlando, Florida. Dissertation Abstracts International, UMI# AAI9100843.

Monroe, C. & Denman, S. (1991). Assimilating adjunct faculty: Problems and opportunities. ACA Bulletin 77, 56-62.

Murphy, S. E. (1980). A study of policies for part-time instruction in the community college. Ph.D. Thesis, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona. Dissertation Abstracts International, UMI# AAI8103051.

Nagy, P. (1993). Examining the employment mix of full- and part-time curriculum faculty. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State Department of Community Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED 375 895.)

National Center for Education Statistics. (1998, February). Fall staff in post-secondary institutions, 1995. [On-line]. Available: http://www.nces.ed.gov/pubs98/98228.html

National Center for Postsecondary Research, Institute for Research in Higher Education. (1998, November/December). Casting new light on old notions: A changing understanding of community college faculty. Change, 43-46.

National Policy Board on Higher Education Institutional Accreditation. (1995, June 20). Presidential committee to develop new proposal for accreditation reform. [On-line]. Available: http://www.llanes.panam.edu/ journal/library/vol1no1/natpol1.html

New Expeditions Coordinating Committee. (2000). The knowledge net: A Report of the New Expeditions initiative. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Newman, M. (1996). Agency of change: One hundred years of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. Kirksville, MO: Thomas Jefferson Press.

North Central Association Quarterly, IX. (1934, July).

North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. Commission on Institutions of Higher Education. (1997a). An overview of accreditation: Frequently asked questions. [On-line]. Available: http://www.ncacihe.org/ overview.ovfaq.cfm

_____ (1997b). An overview of accreditation: General Institutional Requirements. [On-line]. Available: http://www. ncacihe.org/ overview. ovgeninst.cfm

_____. (1997c). An overview of accreditation: The Commission on Institutions of Higher Education. [On-line]. Available:http://www.ncacihe. org/overview.ovcihe.cfm

_____. (1997d). An overview of accreditation: The Criteria for Accreditation. [On-line]. Available: http://www.ncacihe.org/overview. ovcriteria.cfm

_____. (1997e). Directory of CIHE affiliated institutions. NCA Quarterly, 72(2).

_____. (1997f). Handbook of accreditation (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: Author.

_____. (1998, February 27). Effective collaboration for the twenty-first century: The Commission and its stakeholders: The report and recommendations of the Committee on Organizational Effectiveness and Future Directions. Chicago, IL: North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education.

_____. (2000a, March). Shaping the Commission's future: The Mission Project Quest for Quality 2000. [On-line]. Available: http://www.ncacihe.org/ mission/ShapingFuture.html, March 2, 2000.

_____. (2000b, April). Academic Quality Improvement Project (AQIP). [On-line]: Available http://www.AQIP.org, July 12, 2000.

Osborn, R. (1990). Part-time faculty development. What do we know and what can we use? Community Services Catalyst, 20(2), 17-21.

Palinchak, R. S. (1993). Regional accreditation and two-year colleges. New

Directions for Community Colleges, 21(3), 5-15.

Palmer, J. C. & Katsinas, S. G. (Eds.). (1996a). Graduate and continuing education for community college leaders: What it means today. New Directions for Community Colleges 24(3).

Palmer, J. C. & Katsinas, S. G. (1996b). Sources and information: Graduate and continuing education for community college leaders. New Directions for Community Colleges 24(3), 95-100.

Parsons, M. H. (1998, April). How the other 2/3 live: Institutional initiatives for part-time faculty assimilation in America's 2-year colleges. Paper presented at Forum 8 of the 78th Annual Convention of the American Association of Community Colleges, Miami, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED 417 793.).

Phillippe, K. (1998). The cost of education: Community colleges a good value. Research Brief (RB-98-2). Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Pollington, M. (1992, March). A tale of two campuses: The part-time English teacher at Brigham Young University and Utah Valley Community College. Paper presented at the 43rd Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Cincinnati, OH. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED 345 255.)

Public Law 105-244, Part H, Section 496, U.S.C., 1099b, October 7, 1998.

Public Law 550, Chapter 875, HR 7656, July 16, 1952, p. 675.

Ratcliff, J. (1987). "First" public junior colleges in an age of reform. Journal of Higher Education, LVIII, 151-89.

Report of the National Policy Board on Higher Education Institutional Accreditation. (1994). Independence, accreditation and the public interest. Special report on accreditation. Washington, DC: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED 377 760.)

Rifkin, T. (1997). The profession and the person: occupational and individual dimensions of community college faculty professionalism. Ph.D. Thesis, University of California, Los Angeles, California. Dissertation Abstracts International, UMI# AAI9803962.

Rodenhouse, M. P. & Torregrosa, C. H. (1998) (Eds.). 1999 Higher Education Directory. Falls Church, VA: Higher Education Publications, Inc.

Roueche, J. E., Roueche, S. D., & Milliron, M. D. (1995). Strangers in their own land: Part-time faculty in American community colleges. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

_____. (1996a). Identifying the strangers: Exploring part-time faculty integration in American community colleges. Community College Review 23(4), 33-48.

_____. (1996b). In the company of strangers: Addressing the utilization and integration of part-time faculty in American community colleges. Community College Journal of Research and Practice 20, 105-117.

Rudestam, K. E., & Newton, Rae, R. (1992). Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide to content and process. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Samuel, F. M. (1989). A strategy to eliminate inequality of higher education. Community College Review 17(2), 41-47.

Schaffer, K. L. (1995). Savior or servant—What is the role of part-time faculty?

(Community Colleges). Ph.D. Thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan. Dissertation Abstracts International, UMI# AAI9619907.

Scheibmeir, A. J. (1980). An investigation of part-time faculty staff development in public community junior colleges in the United States. Ph.D. Thesis, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Carbondale, Illinois. Dissertation Abstracts International, UMI# AAI8909333.

Schneider, A. (1998, March 13). More professors are working part-time and more teach at 2-year colleges: Education Department survey reveals changes in hiring, tenure, gender, and race. The Chronicle of Higher Education, A14-16.

Selvadurai, R. H. (1990). Advantages and disadvantages of hiring part-time faculty in higher education. Community Review 10(1-2), 198.

Shawn, N. M. (1983). The evolution of regional accreditation in higher education: The role of the North Central Association, 1895-1934. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 8(1), 1-18.

Simmons, H. (1993, Fall). Accreditation and the community college: Challenges and opportunities. In New Directions for Community Colleges, 83, 83-91.

Spangler, M. S. (1990). Part-time faculty: Recognizing an unprotected minority. Position Paper (120), Los Angeles, CA: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED 321 793.)

Thompson, K. (1992). Recognizing mutual interests. Academe, 78(6), 22-26.

Tobin, R. W. (1994, July-August). The age of accreditation: A regional perspective. Academe, 26-33.

Torabi, M. R. (1991). Factors affecting response rate in mail survey questionnaires. Health Values, 15(5), 57-59.

Tuckman, H. P. (1978). Who is part-time in academe. AAUP Bulletin, 64, 305-315.

Twigg, H. P. (1989, November). Uses and abuses of adjunct faculty in higher education. Paper Presented at a National Conference of the Community College Humanities Association, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED 311 984.)

Vaughn, G. B. (2000). The community college story (2nd edition). Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Walker, P. A. (1998, May 29). The economic imperatives for using more full-time and fewer adjunct professors. The Chronicle of Higher Education, B6.

Washington State Board of Community and Technical Colleges, Education Division. (1998, June). Part-time faculty in Washington community and technical colleges. (Research Report No. 98-4). Olympia, WA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED 430 642.)

Willett, L. H. (1980). Comparison of instructional effectiveness of full- and part-time faculty. Community/Junior College Research Quarterly 5(1), 23-30.

Williams, M. D. W. (1995). Student perceptions of effective instructional behaviors displayed by community college part-time faculty members and the part-time faculty members' participation in professional development activities. Ph.D. Thesis, The University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, Mississippi. Dissertation Abstracts International, UMI# AAI9606327.

Williamson, L. V. & Mulholland, K. (1993, May). Adjuncts disjunct? Your institution's defunct. Paper presented at the 15th Annual International Conference of the National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development on Teaching Excellence and Conference of Administrators, Austin, AX. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, no. ED 382 262.)

Wilson, R. (1998, July 24). For some adjunct faculty member, the tenure track holds little appeal. The Chronicle of Higher Education, A9-A10.

Wright, L. E. (19950. The effects of the utilization of adjunct faculty on the performance of community college students: A theoretical case study. M.A. Thesis, The University of Texas at Arlington, Arlington, Texas. Dissertation Abstracts International, UMI# AAI1376043.

Yammarino, F.J., Skinner, S.J., & Childers, T. L. (1991). Understanding mail survey response behavior: A meta-analysis. Public Opinion Quarterly 55, 613-39.

Zook, G. F. & Haggerty, M. E. (1936). The evaluation of higher institutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zwerling, L. S. (1976). Second best: The crisis of the community college. New York: MGraw-Hill.

Appendix A

Excerpts of the Accrediting Standards and Policies Regarding Part-Time Faculty From the Country's Regional Accreditors

Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (Commission on Higher Education): There is no precise formula for determining the balance between full-time and part-time faculty ... . Part-time faculty usually accept teaching appointments as a commitment secondary to other responsibilities. They do not have the time to devote to committees, counseling, and other normal faculty duties. The full-time faculty bears an increased burden in these areas as the proportion of part-time faculty rises, with direct implications for the morale and effectiveness of the full-time faculty.

New England Association of Schools and Colleges (Commission on Institutions of Higher Education): The faculty includes adequate numbers of individuals whose time commitment to the institution is sufficient to assure the accomplishment of classroom and out-of-classroom responsibilities ... . It avoids undue dependence on part-time faculty, adjuncts, and graduate assistants to conduct classroom instruction.

North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (Commission on Institutions of Higher Education): Faculty responsibilities at an institution are best fulfilled when a core of full-time teaching faculty has as its primary commitment the education programs provided by the institution. This means full-time rather than part-time employment at the institution. There is no precise mathematical formula to determine the appropriate number of full-time faculty each institution should have. However, it is reasonable to expect that an institution would seldom have fewer than one full-time faculty member for each major that it offers.

Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges (Commission on Colleges): Institutions commonly employ some part-time faculty to achieve various purposes, but a core of full-time instructional faculty with major professional commitment to the institution and with appropriate professional qualifications for the programs offered is deemed essential. Where such a core does not exist, the institution must demonstrate clearly and definitively that its students and the institution itself are being well served without it. [Northwest has devised new standards, to take effect in 1998.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (Commission on Colleges): The employment of part-time faculty members can provide expertise to enhance the educational effectiveness of an institution but the number of part-time faculty members must be limited. Part-time faculty members teaching courses for credit must meet the same requirements for professional, experiential and scholarly preparation as their full-time counterparts teaching in the same disciplines.

Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Senior College Commission: (Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges): There must be a core of full-time faculty whose primary employment obligation is to teaching and research at the institution. ... With regard to the obligations and responsibilities of part-time faculty, the institution has a policy designed to integrate them appropriately into the life of the institution.

Source: "Accrediting standards regarding part-time instructors…." (1997, November 7). The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. A13.

Appendix B

The Katsinas & Lacey (1996) Community College Classification System

I. Publicly Controlled Two-Year Institutions

A. Rural Community Colleges- located outside of metropolitan areas of 100 largest U.S. cities

1. Small Colleges (FTE < 1,000 students)
2. Medium-Sized Colleges (FTE = 1,000- 2,499 students)
3. Large-Sized Colleges (FTE > 2,500 and above)

B. Suburban Community Colleges- located within metropolitan areas of 100 largest U.S. Cities

4. Single Campus
5. Multi-Campus

C. Urban Community Colleges- located within 100 largest U.S. Cities

6. Single Campus
7. Multi-Campus

II. Privately Controlled Two-Year Institutions

8. Private, Non-Profit
9. Proprietary

III. Federally Chartered and Special Use Institutions

10. Tribal Colleges
11. Special Use Institutions

Source: Katsinas, S. G., & Lacey, V. A. (1996). A classification of community colleges in the United States: A technical report prepared for The Ford Foundation Education and Culture Program Grant Number 930-579, p. 60.

Appendix C

A Chronology of Accreditation: Events Leading Up to the Establishment of the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA)

1938: The first initiative to create an oversight organization began when a joint committee on accrediting was established by the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities and the National Association of State Universities, later joined by the Association of American Universities.

1949: The joint committee on accrediting developed into the National Commission on Accrediting (NCA), which became the first national organization to develop criteria and a process to recognize accrediting bodies.

1975: The NCA merged with the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education (FRACHE) to form the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA). COPA recognized, coordinated, and periodically reviewed the work of postsecondary accrediting bodies--regional, national, and specialized organizations that accredit non-degree- and/or degree-granting institutions and programs.

1993: On December 31, COPA disbanded, leaving no national voice for accreditation or coordination of accrediting bodies.

In August, the Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors (ASPA) was incorporated to improve accreditation and to represent the interests of its members to the higher education, accreditation and governmental communities.

1994: On January 1, the commission on Recognition of Postsecondary Accreditation (CORPA) was formed to continue only the recognition process that had been conducted by COPA.

On January 26, the National Policy Board on Higher Education Institutional Accreditation (NPB), composed of the heads of eight regional accrediting bodies and seven higher education associations, convened to address concerns about federal regulations affecting higher education accreditation, work toward common requirements among the regional accrediting commissions, and develop a proposal for an organization that would succeed COPA.

In October, the NPB widely circulated a draft proposal to create a new national organization, the Higher Education Accreditation Board, to oversee and coordinate accreditation. The proposal stimulated debate but did not generate consensus.

1995: In March, the NPB circulated a revised draft proposal, based on feedback received, to create an Accreditation Coordinating Council. No consensus was reached about whether or what kind of national entity should be established.

In June, at a Conference on the Future of Accreditation, college and university presidents and trustees affirmed the value of accreditation and recommended that institutional chief executives assume responsibility for drafting a plan to create a national organization to coordinate accreditation.

In July, the Presidents Work Group on Accreditation, composed of twenty-four college and university presidents and one trustee, was formed.

In August, the group held its first meeting to address the following questions: Does accreditation matter? How well is the system functioning? Is a national body needed? The presidents group concluded that a national organization is crucial to the long-term survival of voluntary self-regulation through accreditation, and developed recommendations for a national organization. In October, the group mailed to college and university chief executives a proposal to create the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA). Comments about the proposal were received through December.

1996: In January, the Presidents Work Group revised the proposal based on feedback received. On March 29, the proposal to create the Council for Higher Education Accreditation, and a ballot to elect a Board of Directors, was disseminated for ratification to 2990 college and university presidents. This was the first national referendum in the history of higher education.

In May, ballots were received from nearly 54 percent (1603) of the colleges and universities. Of the institutions voting, 94 percent supported the establishment of the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. The proposed Board of Directors was elected.

In July, the Board of Directors of the Council for Higher Education Accreditation will hold its first meeting to begin the process of establishing the organization and hiring an interim staff. The Board also will work with the Commission on Recognition of Postsecondary Accreditation (CORPA) to effect an orderly transition of its recognition responsibilities to the Council.

Note: For more than 50 years, in one form or another, a national body has existed for purposes of coordination and oversight of accrediting bodies and activities. The new Council for Higher Education Accreditation will be similar in many respects to these earlier efforts, but it will differ in the following ways: the new Council will be accountable to member institutions, not to accrediting bodies or presidential associations; through its board of directors and otherwise, it will have much stronger presidential involvement and control; when compared with earlier bodies, the Council's mandate is clearer, stronger, and broader; and it is the first such body to have been created by a national referendum.

Source: Council for Higher Education Accreditation. (1996, June). A chronology of accreditation: Events leading to the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. Prepared by: Billie Stewart, consultant to the NPB and Presidents Work Group. [On-line]. Available: http://www.chea.org/ index.htm/Perspectives/ history.htm

Appendix D

The North Central Association of Colleges and Schools-Commission on Institutions of Higher Education's (NCA-CIHE) Criteria for Accreditation and Related Patterns of Evidence

In addition to the General Institutional Requirements, an institution seeking accreditation by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education demonstrates that it satisfies five Criteria for Accreditation. Because all five of the Commission's Criteria are critical to overall institutional effectiveness, meeting all five is required for accreditation.

In analyzing an institution to identify its strengths and weaknesses, both institutions and evaluators must understand what is judged under which criterion. To assist those involved in making these judgments, the Commission provides a list of typical areas of institutional activity or concern that form a "Pattern of Evidence" related directly to the satisfaction of each of the five criteria.

These indicators illustrate characteristic varieties of evidence that an institution might present in building its case. These indicators are not "checklists," nor are they exhaustive; they are broad descriptions of the kind of concerns and issues the Commission considers when making a holistic decision on each criterion. Not every indicator will be critical for every institution; many institutions include additional indicators of their success in fulfilling the criteria.

The five Criteria for Accreditation are:

Criterion 1: The institution has clear and publicly stated purposes consistent with its mission and appropriate to an institution of higher education.

In determining appropriate patterns of evidence for this criterion, the Commission considers evidence such as:

1. Long- and short-range institutional and educational goals.
2. Processes, involving its constituencies, through which the institution evaluates its purposes.
3. Decision-making processes that are appropriate to its stated mission and purposes.
4. Understanding of the stated purposes by institutional constituencies.
5. Efforts to keep the public informed of its institutional and educational goals through documents such as the catalog and program brochures.
6. Support for freedom of inquiry for faculty and students.
7. Institutional commitment to excellence in both the teaching provided by faculty and the learning expected of students.

Criterion 2: The institution has effectively organized the human, financial, and physical resources necessary to accomplish its purposes.

In determining appropriate patterns of evidence for this criterion, the Commission considers evidence such as:

1. Governance by a board consisting of informed people who understand their responsibilities, function in accordance with stated board policies, and have the resolve necessary to preserve the institution's integrity.
2. Effective administration through well-defined and understood organizational structures, policies, and procedures.
3. Qualified and experienced administrative personnel who oversee institutional activities and exercise appropriate responsibility for them.
4. Systems of governance that provide dependable information to the institution's constituencies and, as appropriate, involve them in the decision-making processes.
5. Faculty with educational credentials that testify to appropriate preparation for the courses they teach.
6. A sufficient number of students enrolled to meet the institution's stated educational purposes.
7. Provision of services that afford all admitted students the opportunity to succeed.
8. A physical plant that supports effective teaching and learning.
9. Conscientious efforts to provide students with a safe and healthy environment.
10. Academic resources and equipment (e.g., libraries, electronic services and products, learning resource centers, laboratories and studios, computers) adequate to support the institution's purposes.
11. A pattern of financial expenditures that shows the commitment to provide both the environment and the human resources necessary for effective teaching and learning.
12. Management of financial resources to maximize the institution's capability to meet its purposes.

Criterion 3: The institution is accomplishing its educational and other purposes.

In determining appropriate patterns of evidence for this criterion, the Commission considers evidence such as:

1. Educational programs appropriate to an institution of higher education:
    a. courses of study in the academic programs that are clearly defined, coherent, and intellectually rigorous;
    b. programs that include courses and/or activities whose purpose is to stimulate the examination and understanding of personal, social, and civic values;
    c. programs that require of the faculty and students (as appropriate to the level of the educational program) the use of scholarship and/or the participation in research as part of the programs; and,
    d. programs that require intellectual interaction between student and faculty and encourage it between student and student.

2. Graduate programs that:
   a. distinguish clearly graduate from undergraduate offerings;
   b. expect students and faculty to value and engage in research, scholarship, and creative activity;
   c. are approved, taught, and evaluated by a graduate faculty that possesses appropriate credentials and experience; and,
   d. use results of regular internal and external peer review processes to ensure quality.

3. Assessment of appropriate student academic achievement in all its programs, documenting:
   a. proficiency in skills and competencies essential for all college-educated adults;
   b. completion of an identifiable and coherent undergraduate level general education component; and,
   c. mastery of the level of knowledge appropriate to the degree granted.

4. Transcripts that accurately reflect student learning and follow commonly accepted practices.

5. Effective teaching that characterizes its courses and academic programs.
6. Ongoing support for professional development for faculty, staff, and administrators.
7. Student services that effectively support the institution's purposes.
8. Staff and faculty service that contributes to the institution's effectiveness.
9. If appropriate:
   a. evidence of support for the stated commitment to basic and applied research through provision of sufficient human, financial, and physical resources to produce effective research;
   b. evidence of support for the stated commitment to the fine and creative arts through provision of sufficient human, financial, and physical resources to produce creative endeavors and activities;
   c. evidence of effective delivery of educational and other services to its community; and,
   d. evidence of development and offering of effective courses and programs to meet the needs of its sponsoring organization and other special constituencies.

Criterion 4: The institution can continue to accomplish its purposes and strengthen its educational effectiveness.

In determining appropriate patterns of evidence for this criterion, the Commission considers evidence such as:

1. A current resource base--financial, physical, and human--that positions the institution for the future.
2. Decision-making processes with tested capability of responding effectively to anticipated and unanticipated challenges to the institution.

3. Structured assessment processes that are continuous, that involve a variety of institutional constituencies, and that provide meaningful and useful information to the planning processes as well as to students, faculty, and administration.
4. Plans as well as ongoing, effective planning processes necessary to the institution's continuance.
5. Resources organized and allocated to support its plans for strengthening both the institution and its programs.

Criterion 5: The institution demonstrates integrity in its practices and relationships.

In determining appropriate patterns of evidence for this criterion, the Commission considers evidence such as:

1. Student, faculty, and staff handbooks that describe various institutional relationships with those constituencies, including appropriate grievance procedures.
2. Policies and practices for the resolution of internal disputes within the institution's constituency.
3. Policies and practices consistent with its mission related to equity of treatment, nondiscrimination, affirmative action, and other means of enhancing access to education and the building of a diverse educational community.
4. Institutional publications, statements, and advertising that describe accurately and fairly the institution, its operations, and its programs.

5. Relationships with other institutions of higher education conducted ethically and responsibly.
6. Appropriate support for resources shared with other institutions.
7. Policies and procedures regarding institutional relationships with and responsibility for intercollegiate athletics, student associations, and subsidiary or related business enterprises.
8. Oversight processes for monitoring contractual arrangements with government, industry, and other organizations.

While the Criteria are intentionally general, the judgments concerning them are founded on careful and detailed examination of the specifics of the institution. Their generality ensures that accreditation decisions focus on the particulars of each institution's own purposes, rather than on trying to make institutions fit into a preestablished mold. The widely different purposes and scopes of educational institutions demand that the criteria by which an institutional accrediting body makes its judgments be broad enough to encompass this diversity, and indeed support innovation, yet be clear enough to ensure acceptable quality.

Source: NCA-CIHE. (1997). Handbook of Accreditation. Chicago: Author, pp. 32-62.

Appendix E

The North Central Association of Colleges and Schools- Commission on Institutions of Higher Education's (NCA-CIHE)

General Institutional Requirements (GIRs)

An institution affiliated with the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools meets the following General Institutional Requirements:

Mission

1. It has a mission statement, formally adopted by the governing board and made public, declaring that it is an institution of higher education.
2. It is a degree-granting institution.

Authorization

3. It has legal authorization to grant its degrees, and it meets all the legal requirements to operate as an institution of higher education wherever it conducts its activities.
4. It has legal documents to confirm its status; not-for-profit, for-profit, or public.

Governance

5. It has a governing board that possesses and exercises necessary legal power to establish and review basic policies that govern the institution.
6. Its governing board includes public members and is sufficiently autonomous from the administration and ownership to assure the integrity of the institution.
7. It has an executive officer designated by the governing board to provide administrative leadership for the institution.
8. Its governing board authorizes the institution's affiliation with the Commission.

Faculty

9. It employs a faculty that has earned from accredited institutions the degrees appropriate to the level of instruction offered by the institution.
10. A sufficient number of the faculty are full-time employees of the institution.
11. Its faculty has a significant role in developing and evaluating all of the institution's educational programs.

Educational Programs

12. It confers degrees.
13. It has degree programs in operation, with students enrolled in them.
14. Its degree programs are compatible with the institution's mission and are based on recognized fields of study at the higher education level.
15. Its degrees are appropriately named, following practices common to institutions of higher education in terms of both length and content of the programs.
16. Its undergraduate degree programs include a coherent general education requirement consistent with the institution's mission and designed to ensure breadth of knowledge and to promote intellectual inquiry.
17. It has admission policies and practices that are consistent with the institution's mission and appropriate to its educational programs.
18. It provides its students access to those learning resources and support services for its degree programs.

Finances

19. It has an external financial audit by a certified public accountant or a public audit agency at least every two years.
20. Its financial documents demonstrate the appropriate allocation and use of resources to support its educational programs.
21. Its financial practices, records, and reports demonstrate fiscal viability.

Public Information

22. Its catalog or other official documents includes its mission statement along with accurate descriptions of its educational programs and degree requirements; its academic calendar; its learning resources; its admissions policies and practices; its academic and non-academic policies and procedures directly affecting students; its

charges and refund policies; and the academic credentials of its faculty and administrators.

23. It accurately discloses its standing with accrediting bodies with which it is affiliated.
24. It makes available upon request information that accurately describes its financial condition.

Source: NCA-CIHE. (1997). Handbook of Accreditation. Chicago: Author, pp. 19-27.

Appendix F

The North Central Association of Colleges and Schools- Commission on Institutions of Higher Education's General Institutional Requirements (GIRs) 9, 10, and 11 and Related Explications Regarding Faculty

An institution affiliated with the [NCA] Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools meets these General Institutional Requirements.

GIR 9: It employs a faculty that has earned from accredited institutions the degrees appropriate to the level of instruction offered by the institution.

This GIR describes the threshold educational requirements for an institution's faculty. In this requirement, faculty includes both full-time and part-time faculty. All of an institution's faculty, both those at its home campus(es) and those at other instructional sites, are included in judging this requirement.

Typically, this means that:

in an institution whose highest degree programs are significantly predominantly at the :	most (i.e., at least two-thirds to three-quarters) of the faculty have earned from accredited institutions:
- associate's level	- bachelor's or graduate degrees
- bachelor's level	- graduate degrees
- graduate level	- doctoral degrees

However, several other factors may lead a team to conclude that this GIR is met. Particularly when judging institutions in or applying for candidacy, a team might consider whether the institution can document the following conditions:

1. All or nearly all faculty teaching transfer courses (i.e., courses in subject areas where work toward the associate degree carries transfer credit toward higher degrees—the liberal arts, business, technology, and an ever-growing number of other fields) hold graduate degrees. (Increasingly, any technical course is liable to be transferable toward a higher degree.)

2. Faculty who now hold less than baccalaureate degrees possess special training, experience, creative production, or other accomplishments or distinctions that qualify them for their specific assignments, and, over the next three to five years, the institution will replace these faculty or upgrade their academic credentials.

3. Faculty who do not hold the typical degrees expected in an institution offering a particular level of instruction are nearing completion of these degrees, or are, with institutional encouragement and support, actively pursuing courses of study that will lead to these degrees within three to five years.

4. The institution has adopted and implemented criteria and processes for hiring and replacing faculty that require possession of the degree typical for and institution offering its level of instruction.

5. Recent changes (i.e., over the last three years in the composition of the faculty demonstrate clearly a pattern that the institution is a moving to improve its faculty's qualifications.

GIR 10: A sufficient number of the faculty are full-time employees of the institution.

This GIR speaks to the need for a core of full-time faculty at every institution. Included are faculty whose primary employment is with the institution, whose responsibilities constitute full-time employment, and whose primary responsibilities are instructional. Administrators "with faculty rank" but with no regularly-assigned teaching duties are not counted for purposes of judging this requirement.

The Commission has determined that faculty responsibilities at an institution are best fulfilled when a core of full-time teaching faculty has as its primary commitment the educational programs provided by the institution. This means full-time rather than part-time employment at the institution. There is no precise mathematical formula to determine the appropriate number of full-time faculty each institutions should have. However, it is reasonable to expect that an institution would usually have at least one full-time faculty member for as many majors as it offers. This expectation captures the common understanding in the higher education community that an institution should limit its program offerings to those that it can adequately staff. A consortial institution staffed by full-time faculty of participating accrediting colleges and universities satisfies this requirement.

GIR 11: Its faculty has a significant role in developing and evaluating all of the institution's educational programs.

This GIR speaks to the role faculty (as defined by GIRs 9 and 10) must play in the design and evaluation of educational programs. Faculty not only provide instruction and advise students, but also are involved in institutional governance and operations through their work on committees and other institutional processes.

Typically, faculty develop curricula, approve all curricular offerings of the institution, and establish ways to evaluate the effectiveness and currency of the curricula. They are responsible for the quality of off-campus as well as on-campus offerings. Through clearly defined structures, faculty and administrators exercise oversight for all educational offerings.

Source: NCA-CIHE. (1997). Handbook of Accreditation. Chicago, IL: Author, 21-22.

Appendix G

Meeting Regional Accreditation Criteria Regarding Part-Time Faculty at Community Colleges: A Survey of Perceptions

*The date for return was changed on the survey sent in the second mailing

Appendix H

Cover Letter Sent to Panel of Experts

Panelist
XXXXX
XXXXX

November 20, 1998

Dear XXXX:

Thank you for agreeing to review the survey instrument developed for my dissertation. To remind you, I am a doctoral student in the Higher Education Program at the University of Toledo (Toledo, OH). My dissertation explores the topic of regional higher education accreditation and part-time faculty at two-year colleges. The primary purpose of the study is to determine the extent of difficulty experienced by two-year colleges accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools-Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (NCA-CIHE) in meeting regional accreditation criteria and General Institutional Requirements (GIRs) regarding part-time faculty. The secondary purpose of the study is to examine the extent of utilization of part-time faculty at NCA-CIHE-accredited two-year colleges. The population under investigation includes all NCA-CIHE-accredited two-year postsecondary educational institutions (340 technical, junior, and community colleges as of Commission actions through Nov. 14, 1997). The survey will be mailed to all chief instructional officers at institutions in the population.

In an effort to enhance its validity, I am asking a "panel of experts" to review the survey instrument constructed for this study. Members on the panel were identified by my dissertation committee and/or the literature of higher education as having extensive knowledge and/or experience in one or more of the following areas, two-year colleges, higher education accreditation, faculty (including part-time faculty) issues, academic affairs administration, and/or research methodologies (survey construction, specifically). Enclosed are draft copies of the cover letter to accompany the survey, the survey instrument, and a research matrix that identifies the study's research questions.

In addition to your comments and/or suggestions regarding the aforementioned draft materials, please provide feedback on the definitions of terms being used throughout the survey. These terms are notoriously difficult to operationalize, consequently they have posed methodological problems in the past for those engaged in research on the topic of two-year college faculty (both full- and part-time faculty).

Members of the panel are assured strict confidentiality. At no time will any panelists' comments and/or suggestions regarding the questionnaire be made available by individual name, institutional and/or organizational affiliation to anyone or any entity (including the researcher's dissertation committee) other than myself. A list of panel members may be included as an appendix to the dissertation, and mailed with the survey to the study participants. Inclusion of your name on this list is strictly voluntary (a statement of consent is on page 2 of this letter).

An Executive Summary of the study results will be sent within two months of its completion to review panelists who return the survey with comments and/or suggestions, and at their request.

Please fax (419/XXX-XXXX) or mail (in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope) this page along with the survey, and your comments and/or suggestions for improving the survey by December 16, 1998.

Do you give permission to include your name on a list of expert review panelists?

[ ] YES I give permission to include my name, professional position, and affiliate institution, organization, or association on the list of expert review panelists if one were to be published as an appendix to the dissertation [ ], and mailed with the survey to the study participants [ ]. *

I give permission to include my name only on the list of expert review panelists if one were to be published as an appendix to the dissertation [ ], and mailed with the survey to the study participants [ ]. *

[ ] NO I do not give permission to include my name, professional position, and/or affiliate institution, organization, or association on the list of expert review panelists if one were to be published as an appendix to the dissertation, or mailed with the survey to the study participants. *

Would you like an executive summary of the survey results? [ ] YES [ ] NO

Name____
Title/Position____
Affiliate Institution, Organization, or Association____________________
____
Address____

Thank you for contributing to the success of this study. Your time and cooperation are greatly appreciated.

If you have any questions, please contact me by phone at 419/XXX-XXXX or e-mail at gbanachowski@xxxxxx

Sincerely,

Grace Banachowski
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Educational Leadership

Dissertation Committee

Chair: Dr. Stephen G. Katsinas
Professor
Department of Educational Leadership
The University of Toledo
Toledo, OH
43606

Dr. Ronald D. Opp
Associate Professor
Department of Educational Leadership
The University of Toledo
Toledo, OH
43606

Dr. Charlotte J. Lee
President
Terra State Community College
Fremont, OH
43420-9670

Dr. Paul V. Unger
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Owens State Community College
Toledo, OH
43699-1947

* The names and affiliate organizations/institutions of panelists were not printed in order to protect their privacy.

Appendix I

Cover Letter Sent to Participants, First Mailing

Participant
XXXX
XXXX

February 22, 1999

Dear Colleague:

The enclosed survey is being sent to chief academic officers at community colleges accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) to ascertain their perceptions toward the utilization of part-time faculty and regional accreditation criteria regarding part-time faculty. It was reviewed for validity by a panel that included faculty and practitioners considered expert in the areas of two-year colleges, higher education accreditation, faculty issues, academic affairs administration, and/or research methodologies.

All survey respondents are assured strict confidentiality. Information reported on the survey form will not be disclosed in association with individual respondents or institutions. Completing and returning the survey will be accepted as consent to participate in this study. Respondents will have an opportunity to request an Executive Summary of the study results at the end of the survey.

It is very important that you participate in this study. Ultimately, study results will provide direction for conducting follow-up investigations to identify "best practices" for employing part-time faculty at NCA-accredited community colleges.

Thank you for contributing to the success of this study. Your time and cooperation are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Grace Banachowski
Research Associate
John H. Russel Center for Educational Leadership

Appendix J

Reminder Postcard

Just A Reminder…

Don't miss the opportunity to participate in a study on part-time faculty and regional accreditation.

Recently, a survey designed to collect data that can be used to identify "best practices" for employing part-time faculty and to improve the regional accreditation process was mailed to chief academic officers at all community colleges accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. If you have already returned a completed survey, please disregard this notice. If you have not returned a survey, please do so by Friday, April 16, 1999.

If you need a copy of the survey and/or a return envelope, please contact me at the address listed on the reverse side of this postcard, or via e-mail at gbanachowski@xxxxxx. Participants may request an Executive Summary of the results when returning the survey. Thanks in advance for contributing to the success of this study. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Grace

Grace Banachowski
Research Associate
John H. Russel Center for Educational Leadership
The University of Toledo
2601 W. Bancroft St.
Toledo, OH 43606

Stamp

Participant
XXXX
XXXX

Appendix K

Cover Letter Sent to Participants, Second Mailing

Participant
XXXX
XXXX

May 15, 1999

Dear Colleague:

In March of this year, the enclosed survey was sent to chief instructional officers at all community colleges accredited by the North central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) to ascertain their perceptions toward the utilization of part-time faculty and regional accreditation criteria regarding part-time faculty. It was reviewed for validity by a panel that included faculty and practitioners considered expert in the areas of two-year colleges, higher education accreditation, faculty issues, academic affairs administration, and/or research methodologies.

Although an acceptable response rate of 55% (or 190) surveys has been achieved to date, I am conducting a second mailing to provide those who did not respond an opportunity to do so. In case you misplaced the survey sent in the first mailing, I have enclosed another survey and self-addressed stamped envelope. If you initially chose not to participate in the study, I am asking you to reconsider and return a completed survey to me by May 28, 1999. The survey takes very little time to complete, approximately 10 minutes. If you have already returned a completed survey, please accept my sincere thanks.

All survey respondents are assured strict confidentiality. Information reported on the survey form will not be disclosed in association with individual respondents or institutions. Completing and returning the survey will be accepted as consent to participate in the study. Respondents have an opportunity to request an Executive Summary of the study results at the end of the survey.

Your participation and feedback are important to the success of this investigation, and will provide meaningful insight into the regional accreditation process. Ultimately, study results will provide direction for conducting follow-up investigations to identify "best practices" for employing part-time faculty at NCA-accredited community colleges.

Thank You. Your time and contribution to the success of this study are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Grace Banachowski
Research Associate
John H. Russel Center for Educational Leadership

Appendix L

Means and Standard Deviations by Community College Type, Data Form Part I (Questionnaire Items 1 Through 15)

DATA FORM PART I: Please indicate the amount of difficulty your institution(s) experiences in meeting each of the following NCA accreditation criteria regarding part-time faculty. (Circle one response for each item.)

Response Category
1= not difficult
2= slightly difficult
3= moderately difficult
4= very difficult

Question 1: Employing part-time faculty that have earned from accredited institutions degrees appropriate to the level of instruction offered by your institution is...

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	2.55	.93	11	1	12
Public Rural Medium	2.54	1.00	59	0	59
Public Rural Large	2.45	.83	60	0	69
Public Suburban Single Campus	1.76	.88	25	0	25
Public Suburban Multi -Campus	1.67	.82	6	0	6
Public Urban Single Campus	1.64	.67	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	1.79	.80	14	0	14
Private Nonprofit	1.62	.96	13	0	13
Private Proprietary	1.80	.84	5	0	5
Tribal	2.30	.82	10	0	10
Special Use	3.00	1.41	2	0	2
Total	2.23	.91	216	1	217

Question 2: Ensuring that all or nearly all part-time faculty teaching transfer courses hold graduate degrees is…

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	3.08	1.00	12	0	12
Public Rural Medium	2.75	.96	59	0	59
Public Rural Large	2.55	.95	60	0	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	1.68	.95	25	0	25
Public Suburban Multi -Campus	1.83	1.33	6	0	6
Public Urban Single Campus	1.45	.93	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	1.63	.50	14	0	14
Private Nonprofit	1.54	.97	13	0	13
Private Proprietary	1.80	.84	5	0	5
Tribal	2.50	.97	10	0	10
Special Use	2.50	.71	2	0	2
Total	2.30	1.07	217	0	217

Question 3: Ensuring part-time faculty teaching general education courses hold graduate degrees that include substantial study (typically a minimum of 18 semester hours at the graduate level) appropriate to the academic field in which they teach is…

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	3.17	1.03	12	0	12
Public Rural Medium	2.78	.91	59	0	59
Public Rural Large	2.63	.99	60	0	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	1.76	1.05	25	0	25
Public Suburban Multi -Campus	1.67	.82	6	0	6
Public Urban Single Campus	1.45	.52	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	1.71	.73	14	0	14
Private Nonprofit	1.54	.97	13	0	13
Private Proprietary	1.80	1.30	5	0	5
Tribal	2.70	.95	10	0	10
Special Use	2.50	2.12	2	0	2
Total	2.37	1.07	217	0	217

Question 4: Ensuring that part-time faculty who hold less than baccalaureate degrees possess special training, experience, creative

production or other accomplishments or distinctions that qualify them for their specific assignments is…

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	2.36	1.21	11	1	12
Public Rural Medium	1.95	.94	58	1	59
Public Rural Large	1.95	.87	58	2	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	1.74	.69	23	2	25
Public Suburban Multi -Campus	1.60	.98	5	1	6
Public Urban Single Campus	1.55	.82	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	1.38	.65	13	1	14
Private Nonprofit	2.25	.89	8	5	13
Private Proprietary	1.40	.55	5	0	5
Tribal	1.88	.64	8	2	10
Special Use	2.00	.00	2	0	2
Total	1.88	.88	202*	15	217

* 14 out of the 15 nonrespondents reported that this question was not applicable because their institution do not hire part-time faculty who hold less than a baccalaureate degree.

Question 5: Upgrading the academic credentials of part-time faculty who hold less than baccalaureate degrees, whether or not they possess special training, experience, creative production, or other accomplishments/distinctions that qualify them for their specific assignments is…

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	3.00	1.10	11	1	12
Public Rural Medium	3.02	.92	57	2	59
Public Rural Large	2.75	1.16	55	5	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	2.81	1.17	21	4	25
Public Suburban Multi -Campus	2.75	1.50	4	2	6
Public Urban Single Campus	2.36	1.12	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	2.82	1.17	11	3	14
Private Nonprofit	3.00	1.29	7	6	13
Private Proprietary	2.60	.55	5	0	5
Tribal	2.86	.90	7	3	10
Special Use	2.00	.00	2	0	2
Total	2.83	1.06	191*	26	217

* 24 out of the 26 nonrespondents reported that this item was not applicable because their institution does not hire part-time faculty who hold less than a baccalaureate degree.

Question 6: Ensuring part-time faculty who do not hold the typical degrees expected in an institution offering the level of instruction are nearing completion of these degrees, or, are with instructional encouragement and support, actively pursuing courses of study that will lead to these degrees within three to five years is…

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	2.91	1.30	11	1	12
Public Rural Medium	2.79	1.00	57	2	59
Public Rural Large	2.59	1.19	56	4	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	2.33	1.09	24	1	25
Public Suburban Multi -Campus	2.00	1.22	5	1	6
Public Urban Single Campus	2.00	.82	10	1	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	2.40	1.07	10	4	14
Private Nonprofit	2.33	1.22	9	4	13
Private Proprietary	2.80	.45	5	0	5
Tribal	3.22	1.09	9	1	10
Special Use	3.00	.00	2	0	2
Total	2.61	1.10	198*	19	217

* 17 out of the 19 nonrespondents reported that this question was not applicable because their institution does not hire part-time faculty who hold less than a baccalaureate degree.

Question 7: Adopting criteria and processes for hiring and replacing part-time faculty that require possession of the degree typical for the level of instruction offered by your institution is…

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	1.92	1.00	12	0	12
Public Rural Medium	2.10	.90	59	0	59
Public Rural Large	1.88	.98	60	0	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	1.64	.86	25	0	25
Public Suburban Multi -Campus	1.33	.82	6	0	6
Public Urban Single Campus	1.27	.47	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	1.23	.60	13	1	14
Private Nonprofit	1.85	1.07	13	0	13
Private Proprietary	1.40	.55	5	0	5
Tribal	2.00	.94	10	0	10
Special Use	3.50	.71	2	0	2
Total	1.84	1.10	.93	1	216

Question 8: Implementing criteria and processes for hiring and replacing part-time faculty that require possession of the degree typical for the level of instruction offered by your institution is…

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	2.33	.98	12	0	12

Public Rural Medium	2.17	.92	58	1	59
Public Rural Large	2.02	.93	60	0	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	1.76	.97	25	0	28
Public Suburban Multi-Campus	1.33	.82	6	0	6
Public Urban Single Campus	1.36	.67	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	1.43	.65	14	0	14
Private Nonprofit	1.85	1.14	13	0	13
Private Proprietary	1.60	.55	5	0	5
Tribal	2.10	.88	10	0	10
Special Use	3.00	1.41	2	0	2
Total	1.95	.94	216	1	217

Question 9: Demonstrating a pattern that your institution is moving to improve its part-time faculty's qualifications as evidenced in recent changes (i.e., over the last three years) in the composition of the faculty is…

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	2.18	1.08	11	1	12
Public Rural Medium	2.02	.87	58	1	59
Public Rural Large	2.22	1.01	60	0	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	1.76	1.01	25	0	25
Public Suburban Multi-Campus	2.00	1.22	5	1	6
Public Urban Single Campus	1.45	.69	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	1.93	.92	14	0	14
Private Nonprofit	1.73	1.01	11	2	13
Private Proprietary	1.80	.84	5	0	5
Tribal	2.11	1.05	9	1	10
Special Use	2.50	.71	2	0	2
Total	2.00	.96	211	6	217

Question 10: Employing a sufficient number of full-time faculty employees is…

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	2.42	1.24	12	0	12
Public Rural Medium	2.07	1.03	59	0	59
Public Rural Large	2.37	1.00	59	1	60

Public Suburban Single Campus	1.96	1.00	24	1	25
Public Suburban Multi -Campus	1.50	.55	6	0	6
Public Urban Single Campus	2.09	.94	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	1.86	.66	14	0	14
Private Nonprofit	2.00	1.08	13	0	13
Private Proprietary	2.40	.55	5	0	5
Tribal	2.00	.82	10	0	10
Special Use	3.00	1.41	2	0	2
Total	2.14	.99	215	2	217

Question 11: Employing at least one full-time faculty member for as many majors as your institution offers is…

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	2.00	1.04	12	0	12
Public Rural Medium	1.95	1.01	59	0	59
Public Rural Large	1.93	.88	60	0	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	1.60	.91	25	0	25
Public Suburban Multi -Campus	1.33	.82	6	0	6
Public Urban Single Campus	1.55	.82	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	1.71	1.14	14	0	14
Private Nonprofit	1.83	1.11	12	1	13
Private Proprietary	2.20	1.30	5	0	5
Tribal	1.78	1.09	9	1	10
Special Use	3.00	1.41	2	0	2
Total	1.86	.98	215	2	217

Question 12: Limiting your institutions' program offerings to those that it can adequately staff is…

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	2.17	1.11	12	0	12
Public Rural Medium	2.23	1.04	57	2	59
Public Rural Large	2.08	.95	59	1	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	2.00	.91	25	0	25

Public Suburban Multi -Campus	1.83	.75	6	0	6
Public Urban Single Campus	1.91	1.22	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	1.93	.92	14	0	14
Private Nonprofit	1.77	1.24	13	0	13
Private Proprietary	1.60	.89	5	0	5
Tribal	1.70	.82	10	0	10
Special Use	2.50	.71	2	0	2
Total	2.05	.99	214	3	217

Question 13: Including part-time faculty in institutional governance is…

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	2.58	1.00	12	0	12
Public Rural Medium	2.84	1.05	57	2	59
Public Rural Large	3.05	1.00	58	2	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	2.88	.93	25	0	25
Public Suburban Multi -Campus	3.00	1.26	6	0	6
Public Urban Single Campus	2.73	1.01	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	2.71	.99	14	0	14
Private Nonprofit	2.54	1.39	13	0	13
Private Proprietary	2.80	.84	5	0	5
Tribal	2.70	1.16	10	0	10
Special Use	1.50	.71	2	0	2
Total	2.84	1.04	213	4	217

Question 14: Including part-time faculty in developing the institution's educational program is…

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	2.75	.87	12	0	12
Public Rural Medium	2.69	.99	59	0	59
Public Rural Large	2.72	1.01	58	2	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	2.68	.80	25	0	25
Public Suburban Multi -Campus	2.83	1.47	6	0	6

Public Urban Single Campus	2.36	.92	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	2.86	.77	14	0	14
Private Nonprofit	2.54	1.27	13	0	13
Private Proprietary	2.60	1.26	5	0	5
Tribal	2.60	1.26	10	0	10
Special Use	2.00	1.41	2	0	2
Total	2.68	.98	215	2	217

Question 15: Including part-time faculty in evaluating the institution's educational program is...

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	2.58	.79	12	0	12
Public Rural Medium	2.52	1.00	58	1	59
Public Rural Large	2.52	.94	58	2	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	2.68	.95	25	0	25
Public Suburban Multi -Campus	3.00	1.26	6	0	6
Public Urban Single Campus	2.55	.93	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	2.50	.76	14	0	14
Private Nonprofit	2.38	1.04	13	0	13
Private Proprietary	2.60	.89	5	0	5
Tribal	2.70	1.16	10	0	10
Special Use	1.00	.00	2	0	2
Total	2.54	.96	214	3	217

Appendix M

Means and Standard Deviations by Community College Type, Data Form Part II (Questionnaire Items 15 Through 26)

DATA FORM PART II: Please indicate the amount of challenge posed to your institution(s) by each of the following activities related to employing part-time faculty. (Circle one response for each item.)

Response Category

1=	not a challenge
2=	a slight challenge
3=	a moderate challenge
4=	a strong challenge

Question 16: Recruiting part-time faculty is...

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	3.08	.67	12	0	12
Public Rural Medium	2.83	.75	59	0	59
Public Rural Large	2.88	.72	59	1	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	2.44	.77	25	0	25
Public Suburban Multi -Campus	2.17	.98	6	0	6
Public Urban Single Campus	2.36	.81	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	2.36	.63	14	0	14
Private Nonprofit	2.23	1.01	13	0	13
Private Proprietary	1.40	.55	5	0	5
Tribal	2.60	.52	10	0	10
Special Use	3.00	.00	2	0	2
Total	2.66	.80	216	1	217

Question 17: Finding part-time faculty well versed in technology based teaching and learning is...

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	3.50	.80	12	0	12
Public Rural Medium	3.17	.81	59	0	59
Public Rural Large	3.37	.74	59	1	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	3.00	.96	25	0	25
Public Suburban Multi -Campus	3.17	.98	6	0	6
Public Urban Single Campus	2.55	.69	11	0	11

Public Urban Multi-Campus	2.92	.86	14	0	14
Private Nonprofit	3.15	.69	13	0	13
Private Proprietary	2.60	1.14	5	0	5
Tribal	3.30	.67	10	0	10
Special Use	3.00	1.41	2	0	2
Total	2.66	.80	216	1	217

Question 18: Selecting/hiring part-time is…

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	2.50	.80	12	0	12
Public Rural Medium	2.58	.79	59	0	59
Public Rural Large	2.52	.77	60	0	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	1.96	.68	25	0	25
Public Suburban Multi -Campus	2.00	.89	6	0	6
Public Urban Single Campus	2.07	.47	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	2.15	.90	14	0	14
Private Nonprofit	1.40	.55	13	0	13
Private Proprietary	2.00	.67	5	0	5
Tribal	2.50	.71	10	0	10
Special Use	2.32	.80	2	0	2
Total	2.66	.80	217	0	217

Question 19: Orienting part-time faculty is…

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	2.50	1.17	12	0	12
Public Rural Medium	2.61	.81	59	0	59
Public Rural Large	2.83	.87	60	0	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	2.20	.76	25	0	25
Public Suburban Multi -Campus	2.67	1.03	6	0	6
Public Urban Single Campus	2.27	.79	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	2.57	.76	14	0	14

Private Nonprofit	2.38	1.12	13	0	13
Private Proprietary	2.00	.71	5	0	5
Tribal	2.50	1.18	10	0	10
Special Use	2.50	.71	2	0	2
Total	2.57	.89	217	0	217

Question 20: Supervising part-time faculty is…

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	2.50	1.00	12	0	12
Public Rural Medium	2.68	.95	59	0	59
Public Rural Large	2.73	.90	60	0	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	2.32	.75	25	0	25
Public Suburban Multi -Campus	3.17	.98	6	0	6
Public Urban Single Campus	2.36	.92	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	2.64	1.15	14	0	14
Private Nonprofit	2.62	.96	13	0	13
Private Proprietary	2.20	.45	5	0	5
Tribal	2.50	1.08	10	0	10
Special Use	1.50	.71	2	0	2
Total	2.60	.93	217	0	217

Question 21: Evaluating part-time faculty is…

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	2.50	.90	12	0	12
Public Rural Medium	2.54	.97	59	0	59
Public Rural Large	2.48	.85	60	0	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	2.08	1.00	25	0	25
Public Suburban Multi -Campus	2.67	1.03	6	0	6
Public Urban Single Campus	2.55	1.04	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	2.57	1.16	14	0	14
Private Nonprofit	2.15	.80	13	0	13

Private Proprietary	2.00	1.00	5	0	5
Tribal	2.80	1.03	10	0	10
Special Use	1.00	.00	2	0	2
Total	2.44	.96	217	0	217

Question 22: Involving part-time faculty in campus life is…

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	3.33	.78	12	0	12
Public Rural Medium	3.22	.85	59	0	59
Public Rural Large	3.38	.98	60	0	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	3.12	.93	25	0	25
Public Suburban Multi -Campus	3.50	.84	6	0	6
Public Urban Single Campus	3.18	.87	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	3.21	.80	14	0	14
Private Nonprofit	2.69	1.18	13	0	13
Private Proprietary	3.00	1.00	5	0	5
Tribal	2.70	1.06	10	0	10
Special Use	2.00	.00	2	0	2
Total	3.19	.93	217	0	217

Question 23: Providing faculty development for part-time faculty is…

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	3.33	.65	12	0	12
Public Rural Medium	3.00	.91	59	0	59
Public Rural Large	3.18	.89	60	0	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	2.72	1.06	25	0	25
Public Suburban Multi -Campus	3.00	1.10	6	0	6
Public Urban Single Campus	2.91	.70	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	2.86	.86	14	0	14
Private Nonprofit	2.91	.94	11	2	13
Private Proprietary	3.20	.84	5	0	5

Tribal	3.10	.99	10	0	10
Special Use	2.00	.00	2	0	2
Total	3.02	.91	215	2	217

Question 24: Monitoring the extent to which part-time faculty maintain current in their discipline is..

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	2.83	.94	12	0	12
Public Rural Medium	3.05	.80	59	0	59
Public Rural Large	3.17	.87	60	0	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	2.64	.99	25	0	25
Public Suburban Multi -Campus	3.67	.52	6	0	6
Public Urban Single Campus	2.82	.60	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	3.07	.73	14	0	14
Private Nonprofit	2.69	.95	13	0	13
Private Proprietary	2.60	.89	5	0	5
Tribal	2.90	.99	10	0	10
Special Use	1.50	.71	2	0	2
Total	2.98	.87	217	0	217

Question 25: Retaining part-time faculty is…

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	2.50	1.17	12	0	12
Public Rural Medium	2.31	.87	59	0	59
Public Rural Large	2.65	.78	60	0	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	2.12	.93	25	0	25
Public Suburban Multi -Campus	2.33	1.03	6	0	6
Public Urban Single Campus	2.27	.90	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	2.38	.87	13	1	14
Private Nonprofit	2.00	1.08	13	0	13
Private Proprietary	2.40	.89	5	0	5
Tribal	2.10	.74	10	0	10

Special Use	1.50	.71	2	0	2
Total	2.36	.88	216	1	217

Appendix N

Means and Standard Deviations by Community College Type, Data Form Part III (Questionnaire Items 26-32)

DATA FORM PART III: Please indicate the amount of influence each of the following reasons has on your institution's(s') decision to employ part-time faculty. (Circle one response for each item.)

Response Category

1= not an influence
2= a slight influence
3= a moderate influence
4= a strong influence

Question 26: Affording institutional flexibility to match fluctuating enrollments is...

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	3.00	1.04	12	0	12
Public Rural Medium	3.10	.80	59	0	59
Public Rural Large	3.32	.83	60	0	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	3.44	.77	25	0	25
Public Suburban Multi -Campus	3.33	.52	6	0	6
Public Urban Single Campus	3.18	.87	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	3.57	.65	14	0	14
Private Nonprofit	2.85	.99	13	0	13
Private Proprietary	3.20	.45	5	0	5
Tribal	3.20	.92	10	0	10
Special Use	2.00	.00	2	0	2
Total	3.22	.83	217	0	217

Question 27: Bringing professional expertise to the classroom is...

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	3.25	1.06	12	0	12
Public Rural Medium	3.07	.81	59	0	59
Public Rural Large	3.27	.82	60	0	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	3.12	1.01	25	0	25
Public Suburban Multi -Campus	3.00	.89	6	0	6
Public Urban Single Campus	3.82	.40	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	3.07	.83	14	0	14
Private Nonprofit	3.00	1.08	13	0	13
Private Proprietary	3.60	.55	5	0	5
Tribal	2.70	.95	10	0	10
Special Use	4.00	.00	2	0	2

Total	3.22	.83	217	0	217

Question 28: Bringing current experience to the classroom is…

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	3.00	1.21	12	0	12
Public Rural Medium	3.08	.79	59	0	59
Public Rural Large	3.28	.80	60	0	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	3.04	.93	25	0	25
Public Suburban Multi-Campus	3.17	.75	6	0	6
Public Urban Single Campus	3.64	.67	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	3.29	.73	14	0	14
Private Nonprofit	2.85	.73	14	0	14
Private Proprietary	3.60	.55	5	0	5
Tribal	2.50	1.18	10	0	10
Special Use	4.00	.00	2	0	2
Total	3.15	.88	217	0	217

Question 29: Bringing practical experience to the classroom is…

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	3.25	.87	12	0	12
Public Rural Medium	3.14	.73	59	0	59
Public Rural Large	3.35	.78	60	0	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	3.28	.89	25	0	25
Public Suburban Multi-Campus	3.17	.75	6	0	6
Public Urban Single Campus	3.55	.69	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	3.29	.83	14	0	14
Private Nonprofit	2.69	1.25	13	0	13
Private Proprietary	3.60	.55	5	0	5
Tribal	2.80	1.03	10	0	10
Special Use	4.00	.00	2	0	2
Total	3.23	.83	217	0	217

Question 30: Providing teaching experience to those who aspire to be full-time faculty members is…

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	2.17	.83	12	0	12
Public Rural Medium	1.95	.73	59	0	59
Public Rural Large	2.00	.80	60	0	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	1.96	.73	25	0	25
Public Suburban Multi -Campus	1.50	.55	6	0	6
Public Urban Single Campus	2.00	.63	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	2.07	.83	14	0	14
Private Nonprofit	1.46	.66	13	0	13
Private Proprietary	2.60	.55	5	0	5
Tribal	2.20	.92	10	0	10
Special Use	3.00	1.41	2	0	2
Total	1.98	.78	217	0	217

Question 31: Saving on costs of faculty salaries is…

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	2.67	1.07	12	0	12
Public Rural Medium	2.95	1.01	59	0	59
Public Rural Large	3.23	.72	60	0	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	2.79	.83	24	1	25
Public Suburban Multi -Campus	3.50	.74	6	0	6
Public Urban Single Campus	3.45	.52	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	2.71	1.07	14	0	14
Private Nonprofit	2.38	1.04	13	0	13
Private Proprietary	3.00	.71	5	0	5
Tribal	3.30	1.06	10	0	10
Special Use	3.00	.00	2	0	2
Total	3.00	.92	216	1	217

Question 32: Saving on costs of faculty benefits (e.g., health insurance) is…

Type	M	SD	n	Missing	N
Public Rural Small	2.42	1.24	12	0	12
Public Rural Medium	2.85	.98	59	0	59
Public Rural Large	3.20	.71	60	0	60
Public Suburban Single Campus	2.84	.90	25	0	25
Public Suburban Multi -Campus	3.17	1.33	6	0	6
Public Urban Single Campus	3.45	.52	11	0	11
Public Urban Multi-Campus	2.64	1.34	14	0	14
Private Nonprofit	2.54	1.13	13	0	13
Private Proprietary	2.60	1.14	5	0	5
Tribal	3.00	1.15	10	0	10
Special Use	3.00	.00	2	0	2
Total	2.93	.97	217	0	217

Appendix O

Chief Instructional Officers' (CIOs) Suggestions and/or Comments by Data Form Part, I, II, and III

Data Form Part I: Meeting Accreditation Criteria For Part-Time Faculty

1. Difficult to answer many of these. General education part-time faculty are in a far different category than technology faculty. The survey may have been more informative if it broke-out the two groups.
2. We are not necessarily convinced that 18 credits at a graduate level rather than 12 makes for a better teacher.
3. Why are more stringent restrictions placed on community college faculty than on faculty at four-year institutions?
4. Answering question number 1 and related questions gives an average as some programs have no difficulty hiring qualified part-timers; others find it very difficult.
5. These questions were difficult in that faculty who teach general education transfer courses typically, with minor exceptions, hold master's degrees. The governing board allows faculty who hold no degree to teach in vocational programs, where there are no accreditation standards, as long as they are experts in the field. For those faculty there is no pressure for a degree.
6. No data supports the notion of significant quality differences between part-time and full-time employees (faculty). This is not proper turf for North Central. They have accredited Phoenix University with NO full-time faculty.

7. Our more rural sites have qualification difficulties. A bachelor of arts degree and 18 graduate credit hours in subject area is difficult to find from high school teachers.
8. We are a small rural college providing services to a large number of small communities (average community population of 1000-3000 people). It is very difficult to find part-time faculty with the required academic credentials.
9. When beginning a community college, we hired part-time faculty. As we grow, we are hiring more full-time faculty members.
10. The major difficulty we have is finding enough qualified computer programming and microcomputer network part-time instructors. This is, of course, a problem for the entire country.
11. These answers are for general education faculty the responses could be quite different for some technical specialty areas.
12. We have the benefit of a large number of qualified individuals.
13. As a tribal community college, we employ native people who have extensive, working knowledge of areas such as tribal law, Ojibwe language, tribal government and economic issues, but don't have degrees in those areas. However, we employ properly credentialed faculty for transfer courses.
14. As an institution located in a rural area with a fairly high cost of living, compensation for part-time faculty is low. We are able to attract qualified adjuncts because it is an area where people want to work and live. Our ability to hire more full-time faculty is limited only by institutional priorities.

15. Living in a very rural area has seriously hampered our ability to find qualified part-time instructors in many disciplines. The result is we simply offer fewer classes with corresponding enrollment drops, especially in the extension center.
16. By contact we are very tightly held to qualifications of our part-time instructors. By contract we must maintain 60% full-time. We are either full-time or part-time none in between.
17. Employing qualified part-time faculty is very difficult for the technology programs.

Data Form Part II: Implementing Practices for Employing Part-Time Faculty

1. As you can feel, we do not face many of the challenges with part-time faculty as other schools. Our part-time faculty attend a full-time faculty meeting each semester and are very active within their divisions. If they do not participate on campus they are not rehired.
2. I would be very interested in finding best practices or educational programs for part-time faculty. I also would be interested in more information on strong mentoring programs between full-time and part-time faculty.
3. Securing part faculty during the day is very difficult in a mostly rural college setting.
4. The "why" of challenges needs to figure into the equation. Otherwise, you still know little.
5. Part-time faculty expect convenient teaching hours.
6. We have a rural location. Quality part-timers are rarely available so we give overloads to full-time instructors and use local high school teachers to fill in.
7. The availability of part-time faculty, we noticed, is very sensitive to changes in the local economy.

8. The difficulty with hiring part-time faculty is very influenced by the area in which the faculty is needed. We have difficulty in computer science, engineering, and other technical fields. A major deterrent is salary.

Data Form Part III: Reasons For Employ Part-Time Faculty

1. At our 2000 head-count two-year college, we employ 35 full-time faculty and 112 adjuncts. Such extremely heavy reliance on part-time faculty and staff is solely driven by a desire to save as much money on salaries and benefits as we can.

Other Suggestions and/or Comments

1. Faculty collective bargaining agreement is a detriment to involving part-time faculty in many of the educational initiatives. It says what full-time faculty do.
2. This is a very timely issue that needs more focus and attention as community colleges seek to become more creditable yet remain fiscally viable.
3. Small colleges will continue to need part-time faculty if they are to survive as institutions.
4. We currently use approximately 20% part-time.
5. Thanks for doing this survey. It is a very important issue at our college.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC
Educational Resources Information Center

Reproduction Release

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Perceptions of Chief Instructional Officers at Community Colleges Regarding the Employment and Utilization of Part-Time Faculty

Author(s): Grace B. Yackee, Ph.D.

Corporate Source:

Publication Date: 12/2000

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign in the indicated space following.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
Level 1	Level 2A	Level 2B
↑ ☑	↑ ☐	↑ ☐
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproductio and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche, or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: Grace B. Yackee	Printed Name/Position/Title: Grace B. Yackee, Ph.D. Associate Dean	
Organization/Address: Owens Community College PO Box 10,000 Toledo, OH 43699-1947	Telephone: 419/661-7198	Fax: 419/661-7366
	E-mail Address: gyackee@owens.edu	Date: 5/2/03

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:

Address:

Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:

Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706
Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)